



# *FUTIFMS International Conference*

---

## **Human Resource Management Strategies, Generational Diversity, and Workplace Productivity in Ogun Central State Hospitals: Evidence from State Hospital, Ijaye, Abeokuta and State Hospital, Ifo, Ogun State**

By

**Al'Hassan-Ewuoso, Hadir O.<sup>1</sup>, Ayo-Balogun, Atinuke O.<sup>2</sup> & Ajibola, Ryhanat O.<sup>3</sup>**  
*Faculty of Management, Federal University of Technology, Ilaro, Ogun State, Nigeria*

### **Abstract**

*Generational diversity has become a defining feature of contemporary healthcare organisations, where employees from different age groups work together under demanding conditions. Effective human resource management (HRM) practices are therefore needed to harness workforce diversity and improve organisational outcomes. This study examined the influence of HRM strategies on generational diversity and workplace productivity in Ogun Central State Hospitals, focusing on State Hospital, Ijaye, Abeokuta, and State Hospital, Ifo, Ogun State. A descriptive survey design was adopted. The study population comprised 400 employees, from which a sample of 200 was selected using Taro Yamane's formula and proportionate stratified sampling. Of the questionnaires distributed, 194 were returned, while 190 were valid for analysis. Data were analysed using descriptive statistics, Pearson correlation, simple linear regression, and multiple regression at the 0.05 significance level. The results revealed that HRM strategies significantly predicted workplace productivity ( $\beta = .613$ ,  $t = 10.63$ ,  $p < .001$ ,  $R^2 = .375$ ). Generational diversity also exerted a positive effect on workplace productivity ( $\beta = .397$ ,  $t = 5.94$ ,  $p < .001$ ,  $R^2 = .158$ ). Inclusive HRM practices significantly enhanced intergenerational collaboration ( $\beta = .544$ ,  $t = 8.89$ ,  $p < .001$ ,  $R^2 = .296$ ). The combined model explained 45% of the variance in workplace productivity, with HRM strategies emerging as the strongest predictor. The study concludes that the productive value of generational diversity depends largely on the quality of HRM systems. It recommends age-inclusive policies, structured mentoring programmes, and leadership practices that promote collaboration among employees across generations.*

**Keywords:** human resource management, generational diversity, workplace productivity, intergenerational collaboration, public hospitals.

---

### **1.0 INTRODUCTION**

Human resource management (HRM) has shifted from a management activity to a strategic tool for enhancing employee performance and organisational effectiveness (Armstrong & Taylor, 2020; SHRM, 2024). The one thing that is becoming a reality in the world of organisations is the generational diversity within the workplace, where members of Baby Boomer, Generation X, Millennial and Generation Z are working side-by-side. While this diversity can encourage knowledge sharing and innovation, it can also lead to tensions and conflicts in the workplace if not managed effectively, due to divergent work values, communication styles and technology use (Lyons & Kuron, 2014; Costanza et al., 2012).

Examination of generational differences is particularly relevant to a healthcare environment because services provided are dependent upon team working, communication and collaboration

*Al'Hassan-Ewuoso, Ayo-Balogun & Ajibola*



## FUTIFMS International Conference

between professionals. Researchers have established that age diversity affects the resilience of employees, knowledge sharing and work outcomes in healthcare (Nunes et al., 2023; Pereira et al., 2021). In addition to completing tasks, workplace productivity in the hospital setting also involves the quality of the service, responsiveness, and the outcome of the patient's healthcare (AHA, 2014). HRM strategies like mentoring, flexible working arrangements, training, and inclusive leadership are becoming more common as ways to leverage generational diversity and enhance organizational performance (SHRM, 2024; CIPM Nigeria, 2025).

The study is based on the Diversity Management Theory and the Social Exchange Theory, both stating that differences in the workforce can be viewed as an organisational asset if good management practices are in place (Blau, 1964). Empirical evidence in this regard, however, on the relationship between HRM strategies, generational diversity and productivity in the work place in Ogun State public hospitals is still scanty. This gap in the context led to the current research.

Thus, this study aimed to investigate the effect of HRM strategies on generational diversity and productivity in the workplace in Ogun Central State Hospitals in order to: (i) assess the influence of HRM strategies on workplace productivity; (ii) examine the effect of generational diversity on workplace productivity; and (iii) evaluate the effect of inclusive HRM practices on intergenerational collaboration. Three hypotheses, namely, HRM strategies do not significantly affect workplace productivity and intergenerational collaboration in Ogun Central State Hospitals, generational diversity does not significantly affect workplace productivity and intergenerational collaboration in Ogun Central State Hospitals, and inclusive HRM practices do not significantly affect workplace productivity and intergenerational collaboration in Ogun Central State Hospitals, were tested.

### 2.0 METHODOLOGY

The study design was a descriptive survey that enabled systematic data collection from a well-defined population and the analysis of relationships between constructs within an organisational context (Creswell & Creswell, 2018). It took place at the Ogun Central Senatorial District public secondary healthcare centres (SHS), namely State Hospital, Ijaye, Abeokuta and State Hospital, Ifo, under the supervision of the Ogun State Hospitals Management Board (2025). There were 400 staff (328 at Ijaye, 72 at Ifo), including clinical (medical officers, nurses, pharmacists, laboratory scientists) and non-clinical staff. A sample of 200 was taken using 5% margin of error and 95% confidence level according to Taro Yamane's (1967) formula. The hospitals were sampled proportionately to their population.

**Table 1**

*Population and Proportionate Sample Allocation*

| Hospital                        | Population | Proportionate Sample | Sampling Fraction (%) |
|---------------------------------|------------|----------------------|-----------------------|
| State Hospital, Ijaye, Abeokuta | 328        | 164                  | 50.0                  |
| State Hospital, Ifo, Ogun State | 72         | 36                   | 50.0                  |
| <b>Total</b>                    | <b>400</b> | <b>200</b>           | <b>50.0</b>           |



## FUTIFMS International Conference

Source: Computed from Ogun State Hospitals Management Board (2025) staffing records.

The unit of analysis was the individual employee. The HRM Strategies, Generational Diversity and Workplace Productivity Scale (HRM GD WPS) was used to self-report data with respect to generational diversity, HRM strategies, inclusive HRM practices, intergenerational collaboration and workplace productivity. The instrument consisted of six sections, namely, Demographics, Generational Diversity (5 items), HRM Strategies (6), Inclusive HRM Practices (5), Intergenerational Collaboration (5), and Workplace Productivity (6), of which the last five sections were measured using a 5-point Likert scale ranging from 1 (Strongly Disagree) to 5 (Strongly Agree). Face and content validity were confirmed by three HRM and methods experts. The reliability measures for all of the constructs were obtained through a pilot test conducted with 25 staff, using Cronbach's alpha, and all constructs were above 0.70 (Hair et al., 2019; Nunnally, 1978). Descriptive statistics, Pearson correlation and simple and multiple regression analyses were performed on the data at a 0.05 level of significance in SPSS 26.

### 3.0 RESULTS

The questionnaires were mailed to the respondents, and the response rate was 83 per cent. 200 questionnaires were sent, and 194 (97%) were returned, 190 (95%) were completed correctly and were suitable for analysis. The response rate is satisfactory for inferential statistical testing (Babbie, 2020).

### 3.2 Reliability of the Research Instrument

Table 2

Reliability Statistics (Cronbach's Alpha)

| Construct                       | No. of items | Cronbach's $\alpha$ | Remark   |
|---------------------------------|--------------|---------------------|----------|
| Generational Diversity          | 5            | 0.847               | Reliable |
| HRM Strategies                  | 6            | 0.885               | Reliable |
| Inclusive HRM Practices         | 5            | 0.896               | Reliable |
| Intergenerational Collaboration | 5            | 0.859               | Reliable |
| Workplace Productivity          | 6            | 0.894               | Reliable |

Source: Field Survey (2026).

All five constructs returned Cronbach's alpha values above the 0.70 threshold (Nunnally, 1978; Hair et al., 2019). Values ranged from  $\alpha=.847$  to  $\alpha=.896$ , confirming the internal consistency of the instrument.



# FUTIFMS International Conference

## 3.3 Descriptive Statistics of the Study Constructs

**Table 3**

*Mean and Standard Deviation of Constructs (n = 190)*

| Construct                             | Mean  | SD    | Min   | Max | Decision |
|---------------------------------------|-------|-------|-------|-----|----------|
| Generational Diversity (GD)           | 3.327 | 0.651 | 1.8   | 5.0 | Moderate |
| HRM Strategies (HRMS)                 | 3.625 | 0.729 | 1.667 | 5.0 | High     |
| Inclusive HRM Practices (IHRMP)       | 3.620 | 0.784 | 1.2   | 5.0 | High     |
| Intergenerational Collaboration (IGC) | 3.462 | 0.691 | 1.8   | 5.0 | Moderate |
| Workplace Productivity (WP)           | 3.804 | 0.694 | 1.833 | 5.0 | High     |

*Decision rule: Mean  $\geq 3.50$  = High; 2.50–3.49 = Moderate;  $< 2.50$  = Low. Source: Field Survey (2026).*

Workplace Productivity returned the highest mean score ( $M=3.80$ ,  $SD=0.69$ ), followed by HRM Strategies ( $M=3.63$ ,  $SD=0.73$ ) and Inclusive HRM Practices ( $M=3.62$ ,  $SD=0.78$ ), all in the high range. Intergenerational Collaboration ( $M=3.46$ ,  $SD=0.69$ ) and Generational Diversity ( $M=3.33$ ,  $SD=0.65$ ) returned moderate scores. This suggests that, although the workforce is age-diverse, collaboration across cohorts is not yet optimal, leaving room for targeted HRM intervention.

## 3.4 Inter-Construct Correlation Analysis

**Table 4**

*Pearson Correlation Matrix of Study Variables (n = 190)*

| Variable | GD      | HRMS    | IHRMP   | IGC     | WP      |
|----------|---------|---------|---------|---------|---------|
| GD       | 1.000** | 0.251** | 0.322** | 0.204** | 0.397** |
| HRMS     | 0.251** | 1.000** | 0.668** | 0.515** | 0.613** |
| IHRMP    | 0.322** | 0.668** | 1.000** | 0.544** | 0.526** |
| IGC      | 0.204** | 0.515** | 0.544** | 1.000** | 0.495** |
| WP       | 0.397** | 0.613** | 0.526** | 0.495** | 1.000** |

*Note. \*\*  $p < .01$ , \*  $p < .05$  (two-tailed). GD = Generational Diversity; HRMS = HRM Strategies; IHRMP = Inclusive HRM Practices; IGC = Intergenerational Collaboration; WP = Workplace Productivity.*

All constructs were positively and significantly correlated at  $p < .01$ . HRM Strategies had the strongest association with Workplace Productivity ( $r=.613$ ,  $p < .01$ ), followed by Inclusive HRM Practices ( $r=.526$ ,  $p < .01$ ) and Intergenerational Collaboration ( $r=.495$ ,  $p < .01$ ). Generational Diversity also correlated positively with Workplace Productivity ( $r=.397$ ,  $p < .01$ ). Inclusive HRM Practices showed the strongest correlation with Intergenerational Collaboration ( $r=.544$ ,  $p < .01$ ),



# FUTIFMS International Conference

providing preliminary support for H0<sub>3</sub>. None of the inter-predictor correlations exceeded the 0.80 multicollinearity threshold (Hair et al., 2019), so multiple regression analysis was appropriate.

## 3.5 Test of Hypotheses

**Table 5**

*Simple Linear Regression Results for H0<sub>1</sub>, H0<sub>2</sub>, and H0<sub>3</sub>*

| Hypothesis / Path                                                           | B     | SE    | $\beta$ | t     | p     | R <sup>2</sup> | F       | Decision              |
|-----------------------------------------------------------------------------|-------|-------|---------|-------|-------|----------------|---------|-----------------------|
| H0 <sub>1</sub> : HRM Strategies → Workplace Productivity                   | 0.584 | 0.055 | 0.613   | 10.63 | <.001 | 0.375          | 112.991 | Reject H <sub>0</sub> |
| H0 <sub>2</sub> : Generational Diversity → Workplace Productivity           | 0.424 | 0.071 | 0.397   | 5.939 | <.001 | 0.158          | 35.267  | Reject H <sub>0</sub> |
| H0 <sub>3</sub> : Inclusive HRM Practices → Intergenerational Collaboration | 0.480 | 0.054 | 0.544   | 8.891 | <.001 | 0.296          | 79.056  | Reject H <sub>0</sub> |

Source: Field Survey (2026). Significance level:  $p < .05$ .  $n = 190$ .

For hypothesis one, HRM strategies significantly accounted for the variance of workplace productivity (37.5%) and the null hypothesis was rejected. The second null hypothesis was rejected as generational diversity was found to have a positive and significant influence on workplace productivity, as it explained 15.8% of the variance. The third null hypothesis was also rejected because there was significant prediction from the HRM practices on intergenerational collaboration, with 29.6% of variance explained. Overall, the findings suggest that the HRM strategies, generational diversity, and inclusive HRM practices all individually have a statistically meaningful and significant impact on the HRM-related outcomes explored in the hospitals studied.

## 3.6 Combined Effect of Predictors on Workplace Productivity

**Table 6**

*Multiple Regression of GD, HRMS and IHRMP on Workplace Productivity*

| Predictor               | B     | SE    | $\beta$ | t     | p     |
|-------------------------|-------|-------|---------|-------|-------|
| (Constant)              | 0.925 | 0.246 | —       | 3.761 | <.001 |
| Generational Diversity  | 0.252 | 0.061 | 0.236   | 4.108 | <.001 |
| HRM Strategies          | 0.435 | 0.070 | 0.457   | 6.240 | <.001 |
| Inclusive HRM Practices | 0.128 | 0.066 | 0.144   | 1.929 | 0.055 |



# *FUTIFMS International Conference*

---

*Model summary:  $R=0.671$ ,  $R^2=0.450$ , Adj.  $R^2=0.441$ ,  $F(3,186)=50.679$ ,  $p<.001$ . Source: Field Survey (2026).*

The combined model is statistically significant,  $F(3,186)=50.68$ ,  $p<.001$ , and explains 45.0% of the variance in Workplace Productivity ( $R^2=.450$ , Adj.  $R^2=.441$ ). HRM Strategies emerged as the strongest predictor ( $\beta=.457$ ,  $p<.001$ ), followed by Generational Diversity ( $\beta=.236$ ,  $p<.001$ ). Inclusive HRM Practices was a positive but marginal predictor in the joint model ( $\beta=.144$ ,  $p=.055$ ), suggesting that its influence on productivity operates mainly through its strong effect on intergenerational collaboration, as confirmed in H0<sub>3</sub>.

## **4.0 DISCUSSION**

This result is in line with previous research which highlights the importance of flexibility, mentoring, communication, training and inclusive leadership in multigenerational workplaces (Amayah & Gedro, 2014; AHA 2014; SHRM, 2024). This highlights the importance of HRM in maintaining quality of services in environments with limited resources as in the Ogun Central State Hospitals. The claim that generational diversity brings a positive impact to the productivity of the workplace is consistent with documented findings that age diversity positively impacts outcomes, when managed well (Lyons & Kuron, 2014; Ravid et al., 2024). The moderate effect size, however, backs up the meta-analysis of Costanza et al (2012) and Ravid et al (2024), which found generational differences to exist, but not to be deterministic, meaning that diversity is not enough – it needs to be supported by organisational systems. The high influence of inclusive HRM practices on intergenerational collaboration aligns with the Social Exchange Theory (Blau, 1964) as this theory indicates that a fair and inclusive HRM practice helps to build reciprocity, mutual respect, and collaboration among different generations (Ilyas et al., 2025; OJIN, 2024; Pereira et al., 2021). This indicates that there is an indirect path to productivity: inclusive HRM promotes collaboration, which leads to better workplace performance. Overall, the findings were in line with the study's funnel logic, as HRM strategies are the general environment of the organisation, generational diversity is the condition of the workforce, and workplace productivity is an important outcome.

## **5.0 CONCLUSION**

The study investigated the relationship between HRM strategies, generational diversity and workplace productivity in Ogun central state hospitals and concluded that all three null hypotheses were rejected. Each of the HRM strategies, generational diversity and inclusive HRM practices has a positive and statistically significant effect and the model as a whole accounts for 45.0% of the variance in workplace productivity, with HRM strategies being the strongest predictor. The study findings suggest that the productive effect of generational diversity is more of a function of HRM systems implemented, rather than age composition. It suggests age-inclusive HR policies, age-inclusive intergenerational mentoring, improved age-sensitive communication and inclusive leadership, flexible supervision and scheduling when possible, and team-based performance management that is linked to care quality. At the policy level, it requires age-inclusive guidelines and regular diversity audits in state hospitals, and shows that HRM strategies are the main means of achieving the productivity of multigenerational workforces.

=====



## *FUTIFMS International Conference*

### References

- American Hospital Association. (2014). *Managing an intergenerational workforce: Strategies for health care transformation*. American Hospital Association.
- Amayah, A. T., & Gedro, J. (2014). Understanding generational diversity: Strategic human resource management and development across the generational divide. *New Horizons in Adult Education and Human Resource Development*, 26(2), 37–48. <https://doi.org/10.1002/nha3.20069>
- Armstrong, M., & Taylor, S. (2020). *Armstrong's handbook of human resource management practice* (15th ed.). Kogan Page.
- Babbie, E. R. (2020). *The practice of social research* (15th ed.). Cengage Learning.
- Blau, P. M. (1964). *Exchange and power in social life*. Wiley.
- Chartered Institute of Personnel Management of Nigeria. (2025). *Employment relationship in a multigenerational workforce: Today's reality*. CIPM Nigeria.
- Costanza, D. P., Badger, J. M., Fraser, R. L., Severt, J. B., & Gade, P. A. (2012). Generational differences in work-related attitudes: A meta-analysis. *Journal of Business and Psychology*, 27(4), 375–394. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s10869-012-9259-4>
- Creswell, J. W., & Creswell, J. D. (2018). *Research design: Qualitative, quantitative, and mixed methods approaches* (5th ed.). SAGE Publications.
- Department of Employment and Workplace Relations. (2020). *Multi-generational workplaces research: Final report*. Australian Government.
- Hair, J. F., Black, W. C., Babin, B. J., & Anderson, R. E. (2019). *Multivariate data analysis* (8th ed.). Cengage Learning.
- Ilyas, M., Ahmed, S., & Rehman, A. (2025). Intergenerational diversity in the workplace: A synthesis of recent evidence. *International Journal of Human Resource Studies*, 15(1), 22–41.
- Lyons, S. T., & Kuron, L. K. J. (2014). Generational differences in the workplace: A review of the evidence and future directions. *Journal of Organizational Behavior*, 35(S1), S139–S157. <https://doi.org/10.1002/job.1913>
- Mahon, J. F., Cole, M. S., & Bruch, H. (2017). Generational differences in the workplace: Communication and recognition needs across cohorts. *Journal of Management Studies*, 54(3), 432–456.
- Nunes, V., Cardoso, M., & Pereira, L. (2023). Generational effect on nurses' work values, engagement, and resilience. *Nursing Open*, 10(5), 2854–2867. <https://doi.org/10.1002/nop2.1530>
- Nunnally, J. C. (1978). *Psychometric theory* (2nd ed.). McGraw-Hill.
- Ogun State Hospitals Management Board. (2025). *Hospital staffing records for State Hospital, Ijaye and State Hospital, Ifo* [Unpublished administrative record]. Ogun State Government.
- Online Journal of Issues in Nursing. (2024). Generational harmony in nursing: Building mutual respect across cohorts. *Online Journal of Issues in Nursing*, 29(2).
- Parry, E., & Urwin, P. (2011). Generational differences in work values: A review of theory and evidence. *International Journal of Management Reviews*, 13(1), 79–96. <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1468-2370.2010.00285.x>
- Pereira, M., Costa, R., & Almeida, A. (2021). Nursing professionals within the intergenerational context during COVID-19: A review. *Journal of Nursing Management*, 29(7), 2061–2074. <https://doi.org/10.1111/jonm.13368>



## *FUTIFMS International Conference*

---

- Ravid, D. M., Tomczak, D. L., & Behrend, T. S. (2024). Generational differences at work? A meta-analysis and qualitative investigation. *Journal of Organizational Behavior*, 45(2), 215–234.
- Sakdiyakorn, M., & Wattanacharoensil, W. (2018). Generational diversity in the workplace: A systematic review in the hospitality context. *Cornell Hospitality Quarterly*, 59(2), 135–159. <https://doi.org/10.1177/1938965517730316>
- Society for Human Resource Management. (2024). *A guide to leading an effective multi-generational workforce*. SHRM.
- Twenge, J. M. (2010). A review of the empirical evidence on generational differences in work attitudes. *Journal of Business and Psychology*, 25(2), 201–210. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s10869-010-9165-6>
- United Nations Economic Commission for Europe. (2025). *Generational diversity: Fostering an inclusive organisational culture*. UNECE.
- Yamane, T. (1967). *Statistics: An introductory analysis* (2nd ed.). Harper & Row.
- Zhang, Y., Liu, J., & Wang, H. (2024). Generational diversity, perceived similarity, and team performance in rural hospitals. *International Journal of Nursing Studies*, 152, 104697. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ijnurstu.2023.104697>