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ABSTRACT

Emphasis on ‘people’ as a source of competitive advantage increases the challenges and expectations for human resource practitioners in New Zealand organisations. To compete effectively in global economies require HR practitioners to live up to the challenges and expectations in HR functions. The aim of this study was to establish if HR practitioners in NZ are equipped with the capabilities for the challenges and expectations of HR effectiveness. Data was collected via an e-survey questionnaire, from 364 members of the Human Resource Institute of New Zealand. The response rate was 41%. Five closely related HR themes were focused on in the research and three are discussed in this paper due to paper limit. Findings show high positive results in self-identified HR capabilities. This signifies that HR practitioners in NZ possess capabilities that can increase HR effectiveness.
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INTRODUCTION

People are the lifeblood of organisations and a company’s workforce represents one of its most potent and valuable resources according to Du Plessis (2009). Consequently, the extent to which a workforce is managed is a critical element in enhancing internal effectiveness and improving the organisation’s competitiveness. Human Resource (HR) practitioners play an increasingly vital role in maximising the efficiency of the organisation’s human resources since HR practices support employee behaviour that is critical for accomplishing key organisational processes, thus advancing organisational success (Stone 2008; Rennie 2003; Wright & Boswell, 2002). It becomes evident that individuals performing in those HR roles need to be equipped with distinct capabilities that support the expectations, challenges and requirements of their roles and responsibilities.

HR practitioners in New Zealand (NZ) have been exposed to challenges and opportunities initiated by the increasing change and complexity of the business environment. The emergence of globalisation, development in technology and telecommunications; the shift towards a knowledge-based workforce, labour legislation and intensifying competition for skilled labour create new competitive realities for organisations. Increasing tightening of competition implies that, regardless of the country in which they
operate, organisations are all under pressure to react to these changing conditions by cultivating a 

Organisations are now looking to the HR function to go beyond the delivery of cost effective 
administrative services and provide expertise on how to leverage human capital (Jamrog & Overholt, 
2004). Simultaneously the role of HR practitioners as strategic business partners and leaders of change 
has also received considerable attention (Du Plessis, 2009; Rennie, 2003; Walker & Stopper, 2000). 
Ultimately, the competitive forces that organisations face today create a new mandate for HR and this 
necessitates changes to the structure and role of the HR function.

In today’s global economy HR practitioners must be prepared to meet the considerable challenges and 
expectations posed by the continuing evolution of their role and show how their function is creating and 
adding value to the organisation. As recognised by Ulrich and Brockbank (2005) HR should not be 
defined by ‘what it does’ but by ‘it’s contribution to achieve organisational excellence’ (p.134).

**PROBLEM STATEMENT**

From the research problem, taking into account the broader focus on key HR activities and functions, one 
realises that there is a need to consider to what extent are HR practitioners in NZ organisations equipped 
with the capabilities that can fulfil the expectations and challenges in HR effectiveness.

**OBJECTIVES OF THIS STUDY**

Several studies were done over the past years in NZ among HR practitioners’ future, capabilities 
challenges and expectations. The ultimate objective of this study is to determine the extent to which the 
current levels of capabilities of HR practitioners in New Zealand organisations match the challenges and 
expectations of their current roles and responsibilities. By comparing this study with NZ organisations 
from previous studies add more value and it informs the reader of how changes have taken place over the 
past ten years in NZ.
METHODOLOGY

The quantitative methodology adopted was an e-survey; a questionnaire containing structured closed questions. This involved the selection of a sample of people from the HR practitioner population in NZ to ascertain how factors differ, and to make inferences about the population, or in other words generalising from sample to population. Reliability of this study was seen as high (41% responded) as previous leading HRM studies conducted in NZ were successful with a response rate of 11% and 34 % respectively.

Sample selection

The study focused on HR practitioners in NZ organisations who are registered as members of the Human Resources Institute of New Zealand (HRINZ). HRINZ have 3600+ individual members who are involved in the management and development of HR in private and public sector organisations throughout NZ. The target population was limited to HRINZ members that had registered to participate in HR research requests that HRINZ provided links to; the total number of HRINZ members in this category was 364.

Data collection

The data was collected via the e-survey, which was specifically designed for this study. The invitation to participate in this study went to 364 members of HRINZ. A total of 179 participants responded to the survey questionnaire, giving a response rate of 41%.

Questionnaire

The questionnaire consisted of six sections with 40 questions (this number was made up of main questions and sub-questions). Several sub-questions were formed to adequately explore each of the five HR themes researched in this study. All the questions in the questionnaire were closed questions. It must be noted that not all five themes are covered in this paper due to the size of the study and length limitation for this paper; it is however, covered in other papers. The Tables reflect the research questions used in this paper and the rationale for using the three specific themes is discussed later.
LITERATURE REVIEW

Background

In the past 100 years the HR profession has been continuously evolving and changing, adding more and different roles and responsibilities. When one traces the HR profession one finds that out of the Industrial Revolution, labour unions and the industrial welfare movement arose as well as groundbreaking research in scientific management and industrial psychology. In the 1980’s climate of anxiety over prospects for economic growth, it became apparent that there was a need for the HR function to become more ‘proactive’ and human resource problems needed to be anticipated and prevented or at least minimised (Gilbertson, 1984). This decade also saw the HR profession faced with criticism and questions regarding its validity, which subsequently resulted in a significant body of research that linked HR practices to organisational performance (Stewart, 1996).

From the 1970s to the 1990s NZ experienced major developments in legislation impacting on employment relations, along with more economic restructuring and radical shifts in the labour demand and supply, enforced a growing awareness of the importance of the ‘human asset’ (Gilbert & Jones, 2000). A generally harsher business environment and increasing competitive pressures caused the HR function to be increasingly seen as a ‘specialist’ role (Macky, 2008). This made it necessary for HR practitioners to recognise that they had the potential to play a key part in maximising the efficiency of the organisation’s human resources. At the same time the role of HR practitioners in NZ organisations was becoming more strategic in orientation (Du Plessis, 2009; Macky, 2008; Boxall, 1995; Stablein & Geare, 1993). HR practitioners started to depict themselves as ‘strategic’ HR professionals who divided their roles into operations and strategy.

The profile of the New Zealand HR practitioner had also changed dramatically. By the late 1990s the majority of HR professionals (60%) were well educated women with a degree or postgraduate qualification and a previous career in HR (Institute of Personnel Management New Zealand, 1997).
Authors have taken different stances when referring to HR practices, but there was a consistent focus on the contribution of HR practices to enhancing human capital. Shared assumptions of a number of authors result in the definition that ‘HR practices are a set of activities that actively contribute to achieving organisational objectives’ (Macky, 2008) and ‘have the ability to gain competitive advantage over other firms’ (Barney & Hesterly, 2006). HR practices, i.e. the programmes, processes and techniques that direct the management of an organisation’s human resources (Wright & Boswell, 2002) can complement, substitute for, or even conflict with other organisational practices and at times arise from reactive and ad hoc choices made by HR practitioners in response to circumstances (Macky, 2008). HR practitioners are an active element in the implementation of HR practices because of their command of professional and business acumen. Their quality, extent of knowledge and experience, level of training and education, combined with a belief in their ability to achieve set objectives has a significant impact on the successful implementation of HR practices (Murphy & Southey, 2003).

The three closest related themes focussed on in this paper are: work-life balance, diversity management, and HR as a strategic partner. These three themes are closely related and will be compared with earlier studies done in New Zealand on the same topics. More themes are discussed in other papers.

**Work-Life Balance**

Finding the ‘balance’ between work and non-work, with neither of them intruding into the other in terms of time, resources and emotional energy (Macky, 2008) could be an elusive goal for more and more employees as the twenty-four hour, seven day working week gains ascendancy (Taylor, 2002). From an HR perspective, this issue causes significant concerns for organisations. The difficulty for employees to maintain a ‘balanced’ life between the paid work they perform and increased responsibilities, such as looking after the elderly or dealing with financial pressures, can cause stress which can translate into decreased productivity and retention issues as employees will look for better working conditions (Härtel, Fujimoto, Strybosch, and Fitzpatrick, 2007). According to Barratt (2007) employers will need to get
serious about work-life balance and go beyond lip-service because: “While organisations talk the talk of work-life balance, the majority are struggling to make it a reality” (p.5).

The organisation’s response to employees’ needs may range from family responsive programmes, which may include components such as leave programmes, dependent care and health/wellness programmes (Macky, 2008; Stone, 2008). Offering flexible work arrangements, which are the cornerstone of almost all work-life balance initiatives, can have significant beneficial results (Strack et al., 2008). One of the reasons for this may well be the fact that the one factor that helped employees achieve ‘balance’ was something in the control of every employer -- that the company was actively helping to achieve a work-life balance for their employees (Campel, 2002).

Many younger employees tend to have new and non-traditional expectations about work. A particular demographic challenge comes from generation Y (people born after 1980). As observed by Guthridge et al. (2008) these individuals demand, among other things, a better work-life balance. It becomes evident that these employees, who operate in positions based on their perception of the organisation’s commitment to work-life balance, need to be managed differently. Ultimately employees are interested in having both a good job and a life beyond work and there is a need for HR practitioners to implement policies and practices that will increase employee commitment (Du Plessis, 2006). This is also noted by Johnson (2000), who states that offering employees work-family balance appears to symbolise an employer’s concern for employees, leading to greater commitment to the organisation.

**Diversity Management**

Managing people from different cultures and backgrounds has become the norm for HR practitioners in NZ organisations because the face of the country is changing continuously. NZ is becoming an increasingly multi-cultural society (Du Plessis, 2009; Jones, Pringle, & Shepherd, 2000). According to Ulrich and Brockbank (2005) worldwide immigration patterns have sharply internationalised the labour force and there is a need for organisations to move beyond intellectual diversity and formally ingrain
diversity into their culture. HR as a profession therefore has to recognise and espouse the value of diversity because diversity management has been identified as an emerging strategic necessity for survival in a globally diverse environment (Du Plessis as cited in Nel et al., 2008).

Härtel et al. (2007) believe it is the responsibility of HR practitioners to manage diversity and to teach other managers and employees what their role in ‘diversity’ is. This is especially important for organisations in NZ because, like many other developed countries, NZ is experiencing skill shortages; in this context, valuing diversity management takes on a new urgency. Immigrants want to retain their cultural and linguistic identity even though they live in NZ (Rudman, 2002). This is creating further challenges to the HR practitioner’s ability to manage a diverse workforce. The challenge is to overcome stereotypes and prejudices and to welcome dissimilarities and differences because diversity management should view employees as ‘unique individuals’.

It also needs to be noted that NZ has the unique existence of biculturalism, which refers to the influence that both Maori and European culture are meant to have on society and in workplaces (Jones et al., 2000). Introducing Maori cultural aspects, such as ‘whanau’ (support) interviews, which is a cultural sensitive selection and promotion method, enables individuals to stay true to their heritage and culture (Macky, 2008). In addition to this biculturalism, there is also a growing number of Pacific Island people, Asians, Indians and many other ethnic groups that can have implications on workplace diversity. Different interest, backgrounds, competencies, skills and talents, if harnessed properly, can be beneficial to productivity and successful teamwork. This is recognised by Ely and Thomas (2001) who say that diverse groups and organisations have performance advantages and the recurrent aspect among high performing groups or teams is the integration of that diversity. Diversity management also involves conscious efforts to actively recruit members from ethnic minorities (Cleland, Pajo, & Toulson, 2000). Demographic trends in NZ clearly indicate that diversity is here to stay; HR practitioners need to recognise the uniqueness of
each individual and the varied perspective and approach to work that they bring to the organisation (Rijamampianina & Carmichael, 2005).

**Strategic role of HR practitioners**

The current normative view of a strategic HR practitioner is depicted as a professional who is able to develop, plan and implement a wide range of organisational activities which are directly linked to organisational performance (Murphy & Southey, 2003). HR practices and policies have strategic implications on organisational performance and in making decisions about any employment related structures HR practitioners must be able to make strategic choices (Boxall & Purcell, 2000). To be seen as truly strategic, important decisions have to be made with a long term perspective (in contrast to day-to-day operational decisions) as changing business conditions, and the organisation’s response to those conditions, influence organisational success (Barney & Hesterly, 2006).

This view fits well with the suggestion by Raich (2002) that there is a clear shift in HRM from a ‘service provider’ to a ‘business partner’. Some companies have even re-titled their HR generalist as ‘Business Partner’ (Jamrog & Overholt, 2004). As pointed out by Ulrich and Brockbank (2005) the capability of providing direct support and to add value to the organisation through the knowledge of the business, will allow the HR professional to join the management team. This increases expectations, new responsibilities, possibilities and opportunities for the HR function. Consequently if HR practitioners want to become key players in the management team they need to have the relevant capabilities to do so (Raich, 2006).

Morley, Gunnigle, O’Sullivan and Collings (2006) refer to the HRM function’s changing characteristics from that of the traditional operational role of personnel specialists, to the strategic role of the HR practitioner. This new approach to design HR practices which develop the strategic value of the organisation’s human capital is termed ‘strategic human resource management’ (SHRM) (Stone 2008; Boxall, 1995; Kane, Crawford, & Grant, 1999). In this role HR practitioners must be able to provide the expertise on how to leverage human capital to create true marketplace differentiation and able to
determine how the company’s current culture, competencies, and structure must change in order to support the organisation’s strategy (Cabrera, 2003).

**ANALYSIS OF THE RESULTS**

**Work-life Balance**

The respondents were asked to state what the developing and implementing policies are in response to changing demographic trends. A total of 54.9% of the respondents regarded it as a ‘strength’/ major strength’. The next question was about the capability to be proactive in the approach to overcoming barriers to implement work-life initiatives and 53.6% of the respondents regarded it as a ‘strength’/ major strength’. An unexpected high percentage (29.1%) gave a ‘neutral’ response in each of the two statements and negative results were indicated by 15.9%. Statement three i.e. successful in benchmarking and measuring the effectiveness of work-life initiatives, was self-perceived as being a ‘strength’/ ‘major strength’ by only 23.8% of respondents (see Table 1).

**Table 1: Self-identified capabilities in the area of Work-Life Balance**

Employees have changing needs and organisations are required to respond to these flexible work styles. Many employees are now looking for more than just remuneration and organisations need to understand this quest in order to assist their staff to have a better balance. Organisations’ responses to employees’ needs may range from providing flexible work arrangements to addressing employees’ growing desire to have more family-friendly working environments. More flexible time-off arrangements can also encourage more education and training, which ultimately addresses the issue of skill shortages. If organisations accept that HR practices are potentially going to produce beneficial outcomes for the organisation and the employee, then the areas of practice that are more likely to contribute positively should be identified. HR practitioners need to be significantly more proactive in their approach towards improving work-life policies.
Diversity Management

Due to increasing diverse workforces in NZ, the last opinion was related to the area of diversity management. Results are illustrated in Table 2 below. When asked to self-identify the capacity to effectively implement diversity management programmes 28.4% gave a positive result and 28.5% gave a negative result. Almost half of the respondents (43%) indicated a ‘neutral’ view regarding this capability. Competency in the ability to deal with the application of legislative issues of diversity management and the ability to effectively use the talents of people from various backgrounds were identified by 54.3% and 54.2% of respondents as ‘strength’/’major strength’.

Table 2: Self-identified capabilities in the area of Diversity Management

Valuing diversity is still not seen as a key priority for the HR function in NZ organisations. Managing diversity is the practice of understanding and embracing social differences for the mutual benefit of both employees and organisations (Wilson, Gahlout, Liu, & Mouly, 2005). Unquestionably, organisations need an action plan for moving diversity initiatives forward. HR practitioners need to be able to have the capabilities to articulate the changes required, make them explicit and to lead the process (Du Plessis, Beaver & Nel, 2006). It can be deduced that even though HR practitioners in NZ organisations have a moderate level of capabilities in diversity management they must invest time and effort to formally ingrain diversity into the culture if they want to maximise the potential of all available talent.

Strategic role of HR practitioners

This question was designed to establish the extent to which HR practitioners possess capabilities that can improve effectiveness in the area of strategic HRM. When queried on the ability to take part in framing business strategies and making key decisions, two thirds (66.2%) of respondents agreed, 17.8% showed a negative result. When asked to indicate their ability to implement coherent HR strategies which are aligned to the business strategy, 78.9% agreed. Developing an achievable vision for the future, whilst envisaging its probable consequences was positively agreed upon by well over half of the respondents.
(64.2%), and only 10.6% disagreed. The capability of providing direct support to the organisation via strategic input got the highest percentage of agreed responses, 81.4%. The last statement had 73.5% of respondents agreeing. It can be deduced that the respondents do understand the importance of being a strategic partner, to provide support via strategic input (81.4%), and to align HR strategies with the organisation’s strategies (see Table 3).

Table 3: Self-identified capabilities in the area of Strategic HRM

The increasing global nature of competition requires that organisations use all of their available resources to survive and to succeed (Sheehan, 2005). The emphasis on the alignment of all functional activities of an organisation toward the achievement of strategic objectives calls for a strategic role of the HR function. Most discussions of a strategic role focus on two major aspects. Firstly, that the HR practitioner should be able to align people with strategies to enable strategy implementation and secondly the HR function needs to ensure that the HR activities and practices are in place to effectively implement the strategy. Given this requirement, it is evident that HR practitioners must have the capabilities to be competent in strategy development, implementation and evaluation. Findings are inconclusive as several factors that emerged from this survey make the researchers question whether the perceived degree of strategic orientation actually reflects reality; HR practitioners only spent 24.2% of their time on strategic input. It can be deduced that HR practitioner’s lack of strategic input is not the result of their incompetence but more likely the result of having to spend most of their time on transactional activities.

COMPARISON BETWEEN STUDIES IN 2000 AND 2008 (CURRENT) IN NZ

An HRM questionnaire covering 358 items to identify HRM and management trends was jointly compiled in New Zealand and Australia in 1994; the same questionnaire was modified and refined and used again in 2000 by Burchell (2001) in association with HRINZ to determine a future perspective on HR in 2010 in NZ. Results were recorded to reflect the percentage of all respondents selecting a
particular alternative for a particular organisation size or occupation. The profile of the respondents is spread over a wide spectrum (refer Table 4 below) and each respondent has some relation to HR.

**Table 4: Profile of respondents by profession in New Zealand in 2000 and 2008**

The profile of the respondents is important to add value to their opinions. In the current (being 2008) study in NZ, the most frequent title was HR Manager (37%), and the next most common title was HR Advisor (27%). Those two titles accounted for 64% of the reported titles. The remaining titles were HR Director (9%), HR Generalist (6%), HR Consultant (3%), and Employment Relations Manager (3%). The category 'others’ (15%) included titles such as HR Coordinator, HR Administrator, Recruitment Consultant, Research Officer, People Development Manager, Chief Human Resources Officer, Sales & Marketing Capability Leader, Talent Management Consultant and Senior Lecturer HRM (Table 4).

In NZ most organisations (83%) have fewer than 10 employees. In this study, the participants are from different sized organisations (Table 5 below); the following groupings were compiled for analysis: small organisations with fewer than 100 employees (0-99); medium 100 to 499 employees, large is 500 or more employees. It should be noted that NZ is predominantly a country of small businesses, with 93.3% of enterprises employing 19 or fewer people ("SMEs in New Zealand: Structure and Dynamics," 2006).

**Table 5: Profile of respondents by organisation size in New Zealand in 2000 and 2008**

**Table 6: Comparison of expectations (2010) and challenges: New Zealand 2000 and 2008.**

**RECOMMENDATIONS FOR HR PRACTITIONERS**

Concrete recommendations addressing the problems identified are proposed in this section. Even though a high level of capabilities is evident in the results in this study (2008), it is recommended for HR practitioners in NZ organisations to increase their exposure to different practices, methods and systems;
this can result in a greater ability to identify potential areas for improvement, as well as the identification of previously unconsidered solutions. To manage work-life balance:

- Develop and implement policies in response to changing demographic trends
- Proactive in the approach to overcoming barriers to implement work-life initiatives

The following capabilities are necessary in the area of diversity management:

- Effectively implement diversity management programmes
- Deal with the application of legislative issues of diversity management
- Use the talents of people from various backgrounds, experiences and cultures

The following capabilities are required to provide significant input into the organisation’s strategy:

- To successfully take part in framing business strategies and making key business decisions
- To develop and implement coherent HR strategies which are aligned to the business strategy
- Develop an achievable vision for the future and envisage its probable consequences

**CONCLUSIONS**

A comparison of the highest rated results reveals significant changes in some areas from the study done in 2000 and the 2008 study in NZ. The three themes show very similar work-life programmes, diversity management philosophies, and strategic roles for HR practitioners in NZ. The most significant one is the expectations and challenges for the HR practitioner in aligning HR strategies with business strategies. Previous studies show an increase in the strategic role from 2000 and 2002 respectively (25% to 2010) and the current study (2008) reflects 81.4%.

The researchers trust that HR practitioners will use the information gained in this study about the capabilities of HR professionals, and the recommendations to build on this knowledge base to create additional new knowledge on HR’s current capabilities and the impact on organisational performance. A new kind of HR practitioner as well as a business manager and employee can be expected in successful organisations in the future adding meaningful value.
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Table 1: Self-identified capabilities in the area of Work-Life Balance

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Q1. WORK/LIFE BALANCE</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1 for 'significant need for improvement' – 3 neutral - 5 for 'major strength'</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Develop &amp; implement policies in response to changing demographic trends</td>
<td>3.3%</td>
<td>12.6%</td>
<td>29.1%</td>
<td>41.0%</td>
<td>13.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Proactive in the approach to overcoming barriers to implement work-life initiatives</td>
<td>5.9%</td>
<td>11.2%</td>
<td>29.1%</td>
<td>39.7%</td>
<td>13.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Successful in benchmarking &amp; measuring the effectiveness of work-life initiatives</td>
<td>7.2%</td>
<td>26.4%</td>
<td>42.4%</td>
<td>17.9%</td>
<td>5.9%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 2: Self-identified capabilities in the area of Diversity Management

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Q2. DIVERSITY MANAGEMENT</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1 for 'significant need for improvement' – 3 neutral - 5 for 'major strength'</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Capacity to effectively implement diversity management programmes</td>
<td>5.3%</td>
<td>23.2%</td>
<td>43.0%</td>
<td>23.8%</td>
<td>4.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Competent to deal with the application of legislative issues of diversity management</td>
<td>4.6%</td>
<td>12.6%</td>
<td>28.5%</td>
<td>38.4%</td>
<td>15.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ability to effectively use the talents of people from various backgrounds, experiences</td>
<td>2.6%</td>
<td>13.9%</td>
<td>29.1%</td>
<td>41.0%</td>
<td>13.2%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 3: Self-identified capabilities in the area of Strategic HRM

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Q3 Indicate the extent to which YOU are currently equipped with the capabilities that can improve effectiveness in STRATEGIC HRM</th>
<th>Strongly agree</th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Neither agree nor disagree</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
<th>Strongly disagree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Able to successfully take part in framing business strategies &amp; making key business decisions</td>
<td>23.2%</td>
<td>43.0%</td>
<td>15.9%</td>
<td>17.2%</td>
<td>0.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ability to develop &amp; implement coherent HR strategies which are aligned to the business strategy</td>
<td>31.2%</td>
<td>47.7%</td>
<td>14.0%</td>
<td>6.6%</td>
<td>0.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Capacity to develop an achievable vision for the future and envisage its probable consequences</td>
<td>20.5%</td>
<td>43.7%</td>
<td>25.1%</td>
<td>9.3%</td>
<td>1.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Capable of providing direct support to the organisation via strategic HRM inputs</td>
<td>39.0%</td>
<td>42.4%</td>
<td>12.6%</td>
<td>4.6%</td>
<td>1.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ability to develop the relevant portfolio of competencies in order to achieve business objectives</td>
<td>20.5%</td>
<td>53.0%</td>
<td>19.9%</td>
<td>6.0%</td>
<td>0.7%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 4: Profile of respondents by profession in New Zealand in 2000 and 2008

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Profession</th>
<th>New Zealand profile 2000</th>
<th>New Zealand profile 2008</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>HR (officer to director)</td>
<td>72.00%</td>
<td>73.00%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Business (line managers to CEO)</td>
<td>10.00%</td>
<td>9.00%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Consultants</td>
<td>14.00%</td>
<td>3.00%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Academic (all tertiary institutions)</td>
<td>4.00%</td>
<td>(see other)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>15.00%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 5: Profile of respondents by organisation size in New Zealand in 2000 and 2008

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Number of employees in organisation</th>
<th>New Zealand profile 2000</th>
<th>New Zealand profile 2008</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Fewer than 10</td>
<td>1.00%</td>
<td>_</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10 – 49</td>
<td>4.00%</td>
<td>_</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>50 – 99</td>
<td>9.00%</td>
<td>13.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>100 – 499</td>
<td>40%</td>
<td>34.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>500 or more</td>
<td>46%</td>
<td>52.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>


<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>%</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Work-life balance</td>
<td>2.0</td>
<td>13.0</td>
<td>86.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Diversity management</td>
<td>20.3</td>
<td>47.2</td>
<td>63.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strategic role aligned with business</td>
<td>16.4</td>
<td>27.4</td>
<td>78.9</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>