

Were Employee Welfare and Work Commitment Impacted by the High Performance Work System?

Muhammad Adnan^{1,2*}, Raisham Hayee³, Muhammad Ahsan Ali², Maham Sarwar⁴

¹ Azteca University (UA), Mexico

² National College of Business Administration & Economics (NCBA&E), Lahore, Multan Sub-Campus, Pakistan

³ NFC-Institute of Engineering and Technology (IET), Multan, Pakistan

⁴ Institute of Banking and Finance, Bahauddin Zakariya University (BZU), Multan, Pakistan

Abstract: The High Performance Work System (HPWS) serves as a decisive tool that enables organizations to prioritize quality work. Despite this, instructors in both public and private higher education do not have a strong enough collective voice to influence its policies at the state and federal levels. This study focuses in particular on the instructors of Higher Education Institutions in Pakistan, to investigate the influence of the HPWS on Employee Welfare and Work Commitment in the context of COVID-19. Nineteen items on a 5.0-point Likert scale, with “1” denoting “Strongly Disagree” and “5” indicating “Strongly Agree” was included in a survey for this study that covers its three latent variables, i.e., HPWS, Work Commitment, and Employee's Welfare. 204 teaching professionals/instructors from higher educational institutions, both public and private, made up the study's participant pool. SmartPLS was used in the measurement and structural model analyzes with Confirmatory Factor Analysis and inter-construct correlation of this study. The study concluded that the HPWS has an implicit and substantial impact on Employee Welfare and determined that Work Commitment significantly mediates the association between HPWS and Employee Welfare. This study includes earlier research on HPWS with effective collaboration and opposing viewpoints. This study contributed to the existing literature novel by concentrating on the complexity of Employees' performance and their workplace environment. This study significantly implicates the HR strategists and managers that to enhance employee engagement with their jobs and duties and to improve employee welfare, academic and corporate institutions should have efficient HPWS implemented within their organizations.

Keywords: employee welfare, work commitment, high performance work system, social exchange theory, higher education institutions.

員工福利和工作承諾是否受到高績效工作制度的影響？

摘要：高性能工作系統是一種決定性工具，使組織能夠優先考慮質量工作。儘管如此，公立和私立高等教育的教師都沒有足夠強大的集體聲音來影響其在州和聯邦層面的政策。本研究特別關注巴基斯坦高等教育機構的教師，以調查高績效工作制度在新冠肺炎的背景下對員工福利和工作承諾的影響。本研究的一項調查包括了5.0點李克特量表的19個項目，其中“1”表示“非常不同意”，“5”表示“非常同意”，涵蓋其三個潛在變量，即高績效工作制度、工作承諾、和員工福利。來自公立和私立高等教育機構的204名教學專業人員/講師組成了該研究的參與者池。智能PLS用於本研究的驗證性因素分析和結構間相關性的測量和結構模型分析。該研究得出結論，高績效工作制度對員工福利具有隱性和實質性影響，並確定工作承諾顯著調解高績效工作制度和員工福利之間的關聯。這項研究包括對高績效工作制度的早期研究，

Received: June 12, 2022 / Revised: July 10, 2022 / Accepted: August 6, 2022 / Published: September 30, 2022

About the authors: Muhammad Adnan, Azteca University (UA), Mexico; National College of Business Administration & Economics (NCBA&E), Lahore, Multan Sub-Campus, Pakistan; Raisham Hayee, NFC-Institute of Engineering and Technology (IET), Multan, Pakistan; Muhammad Ahsan Ali, National College of Business Administration & Economics (NCBA&E), Lahore, Multan Sub-Campus, Pakistan; Maham Sarwar, Institute of Banking and Finance, Bahauddin Zakariya University (BZU), Multan, Pakistan

Corresponding author Muhammad Adnan, dr.adnanmalik1989@gmail.com

具有有效的合作和相反的觀點。這項研究通過關注員工績效及其工作環境的複雜性，為現有的文學小說做出了貢獻。這項研究顯著暗示了人力資源戰略家和管理人員，為了提高員工對其工作和職責的參與度並改善員工福利，學術和企業機構應該在其組織內實施有效的高績效工作制度。

关键词：員工福利、工作承諾、高績效工作制度、社會交換理論，高等教育機構。

1. Introduction

Human resource management practices categorized as "High Performance Work Systems (HPWS)" have received increased evidence-based research since the mid-1990s. HPWS are broadly defined as human resource management practices comprising performance-related compensation, several employee communication programs, teamwork, and training [4, 25]. The prime focus of this research was on the consequences of such practices on organizational performance, and it was well written from a managerial perspective [4]. Simultaneously, some research has been done concerning High Performance Work Systems on Employees Welfare [24]. It was concluded that HPWS could help improve organizational performance [11].

Workers must be treated with respect and given proper benefits and incentives because they are vital to the means of production. These advantages will increase their sense of value, raise their self-esteem and financial situation and serve as a form of encouragement to arouse tremendous enthusiasm for their work and boost productivity [42]. Employers prioritizing long-term sustainable organizational growth over short-term, fast profits should offer more perks to employees. Employers must provide welfare benefits, and other incentives must be provided to employees employers to foster employee motivation, which dramatically impacts output and results. The organization, employers, and employees will benefit from the HPWS [13]. Employee welfare and self-esteem are more crucial in the HPWS, and firms that invest more in benefits that promote employee welfare and morale see productivity increases [24].

Previous research on HPWS and organizational performance and employee well-being is rare. Still, this paper will cover the gap by making many contributions to the literature on HPWS. Firstly, indicators based on actual data are presented in this study about the effect of HPWS on employee welfare, particularly in higher education. Second, the study emphasizes the mediating mechanism by examining job dedication's role in establishing the correlation between HPWS and employee welfare. Finally, this study analyses various functions of HPWS activities within the businesses that may have a noticeable impact on the welfare of the

workforce. The study's goal is to determine how HPWS impacts organizational performance and employee welfare with the mediating effect of work commitment.

2. Literature Review

2.1. High Performance Work System (HPWS)

Generally speaking, HPWS entail procedures of human resource management that include a reward for performance, numerous internal communication initiatives, collaboration, and education [4, 25]. Furthermore, HPWS can contribute to improved performance of the organization [11].

2.2. Work Commitment

Work commitment is described as (a) the level of professional motivation, (b) the significance of a job as a source of fulfillment, and (c) the level of importance given to a job in comparison with other forms of fulfillment [29].

2.3. Employee Welfare

The pursuit of someone's social, moral, cognitive, and physical well-being is referred to as welfare. In 1969, the Review Panel on Labor Welfare gave a distinct definition of the term. They defined this as adequate dining facilities, recreational facilities, adequate sanitation and health center plans for commuting and for people hired at a distance from their residence, and other offerings, facilities and amenities.

3. Hypothesis Development

3.1. Relationship of HPWS with Employee's Welfare

In previous years, literature supported the human resource practices that affect organizational performance [11]. The central concept of this literature is the concept of HPWS, which reflects a substantial impact on organizational performance [37, 46]. The substantial evidences in the literature support the fact that HPWS, when integrated with other HR practices, is an essential element that can assist organizations in achieving a competitive advantage. By investing in High Performance Work System, they can accomplish a bunch of trained, talented and empowered employees

who are capable of doing jobs efficiently [15]. Numerous pieces of research have concluded that High Performance Work System is linked with progressive employee outcomes, i.e., employee performance [28, 45], that leads to advanced organizational performance [26, 31].

Although numerous laws require employers to offer welfare benefits to their workers, their implementation and enforcement pose the biggest obstacles to the execution of their requirements [39]. Nowadays, it's more difficult and contentious to address concerns relating to welfare and decent quality of life for employees who are engaged in helpful labor but have no social-economic allowances to raise their standard of living [8]. These problems frequently arise in disputes amongst union members, which may escalate to strike or lockout measures [38]. Lack of or insufficient employee welfare benefits negatively influence workers' social and organizational conditions and capacity [15]. This could affect the team spirit, which confines the strong ability to convey an overarching normative or moral structure. Simultaneously, work environment change could explain, leaving the team system questionable to anomic tendencies, status differentiations among hourly workers, and different sources of variability [43].

Employee welfare benefits boost employee motivation, whereas employee motivation results in productivity. Employee welfare packages significantly impact organizational performance [1]. The mentioned hypothesis declaration is discovered due to the hypothesis that there is a meaningful correlation between high performance work systems and employee welfare.

Hypothesis 1: Employee welfare and HPWS form a significant relationship.

3.2. The Relationship of HPWS with Work Commitment

Several aspects of HRM, including employee loyalty, hiring procedures, ongoing and in-depth training, and various performance-based remuneration plans, are at the heart of high performance work systems [27, 40]. Consequently, HPWS is a multidimensional concept that most likely positively influences corporate welfare. Additionally, a vital perspective has been stated in most publications from earlier HPWS literature, indicating that researchers are becoming more concerned with their subjects' work outcomes. [9, 21] to understand how Work Commitment is related to HPWS, some researchers have investigated how HPWS impacts work commitment between subordinates and managers. According to the findings, women and managers have

expanded work commitment in organizations using HPWS [2]. As per [22], workers are more efficient if they are more engaged in the organization decision-making. Research reflects that employees are most likely more interested in their work if effective HR practices are integrated with operative work commitment. Thus, the following statement can be hypothesized

Hypothesis 2: Work Commitment and HPWS have a significant relationship.

3.3. Work Commitment as a Mediator: Mediation Impact on the Relationship between HPWS and Employee Welfare

The social exchange theory [6] and the academic literature on High Performance Work Systems [32, 33, and 36] have both demonstrated that the performance of employees is directly related to the quality of the work environment [44] and the work place [7]. This theory claims that by giving employees a comfortable workplace and enough benefits, businesses may develop loyal, contented employees who will yield incredible results [6, 12]. This predominantly stands because they consider these perspectives of responsibility as indicators of better work execution. Recent literature has also shown a significant relationship between employee welfare and HPWS [10]. [16] analyzed the correlation between the perception of HPWS and commitment. This shows that work commitment has a mediating impact on the connection between HPWS and performance. This ultimately leads to enhance employee welfare. Hence, the following statement can be hypothesized.

Hypothesis 3: Work Commitment significantly mediates the relationship between HPWS and Employee Welfare.

3.4. Conceptual Framework



Fig. 1 Impact of HPWS on employee's welfare

4. Methodology

4.1. Research Design

It is the prime responsibility of the researcher during his research to briefly describe the research design, i.e., which research approach is used [35]. This study used the quantitative approach because it used a questionnaire to collect individual responses. The philosophy used in this research is positivism, as this comprehends the general philosophical position [35]. This study used the deductive approach as it has used

social exchange theory, which comprehends that HPWS is vital for any organization as it leads to better work commitment within the firm [41]. Survey research is being used to comprehend the data gathered from the sample of the whole population [35]. A systemized set of questions with a 5-point Likert scale was used during the survey for data collection.

4.2. Population and Sample

In view of the fact that the total population of teachers employed in higher education institutions in Pakistan is unknown, about 240 instructors were selected for the study's data collection through a questionnaire survey. This is because there are no details on the overall population. For the analysis of PLS-SEM, the sample size between 100 and 200 subjects for populating unknown subjects is sufficient [20].

4.3. Sampling Technique

Since non-probability convenience sampling is an effective method for gathering information from respondents, the study uses it to determine the effect of HPWS on employee welfare and performance [3].

4.4. Underpinning Social Exchange Theory

Social exchange theory describes the cost benefit evaluation of a connection between two individuals in any society. It is a metric for gauging individual effort considering this relationship. This assessment makes it possible to assess how much effort each person makes in any particular relationship. The main goal of this finding is to establish the effectiveness of HR actions that organizations must have to raise work commitment through building their welfare.

4.5. Data Collection

To collect data for the study, researchers visited several colleges and universities that provide higher education to students in the study population in South Punjab, Pakistan. The faculty members hired to teach students at all levels of the university completed the questionnaires. Based on [34], if a population is greater than 10,000 or is unknown, then a sample size of 100–200 should be adequate for the study. Thus, a finalized sample set of 204 of 240 respondents were taken to conduct the study's analysis using Partial Least Square (PLS) with Structural Equation Modeling (SEM). A total of 67.2% of the participants were male, 32.8% - female.

4.6. Research Instruments and Scale Measures

To gather information about the parameters of the current study, namely, the HPWS, the work commitment of the employees, and the employee welfare of the employees. A questionnaire made up of 19 sets of formalized questions was designed. The most recent test used the 5.0-point Likert Scale, which has

previously been used in social studies [14].

4.7. High Performance Work System (HPWS)

Five items were on the High Performance Work System (HPWS) scale, a 5-point Likert scale in which a score of '1' indicates "Strongly Disagree" whereas a score of '5' indicates "Strongly Agree." The HPWS scale was modified from research project [41].

4.8. Work Commitment

To measure work commitment, this study adapted a 5.0-point Likert Scale that was developed by [41] and modified it for the purposes of evaluation. The scale is from '1' to '5' and as the name implies, '1' means 'Strongly Disagree', and '5' means 'Strongly Agree.'

4.9. Employee's Welfare

The study adopts a 5.0-point Likert scale from [23] to determine employee welfare, with '1' denoting "Strongly Disagree" and '5' denoting "Strongly Agree."

4.10. Data Analysis

Most of the investigators used Partial Least Square - Structural Equation Modelling (PLS-SEM), relatively common in the existing climate, particularly in managerial activities, to conduct the study. It usually uses integrated regression analysis inside these latent variables [18, 19]. For components with a developmental nature and a theoretical foundation, PLS-SEM is a perfect fit and practical tool. PLS-SEM is the optimal analytical technique because this report's structural model, which is constructive, includes Employee Welfare as a targeted component. Additionally, PLS-SEM is thought to be the most helpful software programmed for analyzing quasi-distributed data, focusing on exploratory studies, and calling for a smaller sample size [20]. Because of this, PLS-SEM is being used in this study's data analysis. The study used PLS-SEM and is divided into two parts: structural modeling (looking at links between the latent constructs hypothesized) and assessing the measurement instrument.

5. Results

5.1. Descriptive Statistics and Correlational Analysis

In order to determine the importance of the connections between latent constructs, it is necessary to examine the sample mean, standard deviations, T-statistics, and their comparative P-values that are used to estimate the degree of correlative influence [20]. Table 1 illustrates the impact of these relationships with respect to the latent constructs.

Table 1 Descriptive statistics

| | Original Sample (O) | Sample Mean (M) | STDEV |
|------------|---------------------|-----------------|-------|
| HPWS -> EW | 0.569 | 0.565 | 0.06 |
| HPWS -> WC | 0.708 | 0.713 | 0.049 |
| WC -> EW | 0.266 | 0.274 | 0.07 |

Table 2 demonstrates the relationship between the latent constructs and the connection with other latent

constructs, while Table 3 shows the similarity between the indicators for each latent construct.

Table 2 Inter-construct correlation

| | Employee Welfare | HPWS | Work Commitment |
|------|------------------|-------|-----------------|
| EW | 1.000 | 0.756 | 0.671 |
| HPWS | | 1.000 | 0.709 |
| WC | | | 1.000 |

Table 3 Indicators' correlation

| | EW 1 | EW2 | EW3 | EW 4 | EW 5 | EW 6 | EW 7 | EW 8 | HPWS1 | HPWS2 | HPWS3 | HPWS4 | HPWS5 | WC 1 | WC 2 | WC 3 | WC4 | WC 5 | WC6 |
|-------|------|-------|-------|-------|-------|-------|-------|-------|-------|-------|-------|-------|-------|-------|-------|-------|-------|-------|-------|
| EW1 | 1 | 0.566 | 0.486 | 0.47 | 0.563 | 0.51 | 0.639 | 0.459 | 0.682 | 0.472 | 0.496 | 0.603 | 0.301 | 0.407 | 0.49 | 0.368 | 0.253 | 0.503 | 0.32 |
| EW2 | | 1 | 0.634 | 0.385 | 0.464 | 0.505 | 0.728 | 0.701 | 0.472 | 0.385 | 0.47 | 0.553 | 0.379 | 0.459 | 0.217 | 0.414 | 0.414 | 0.48 | 0.592 |
| EW3 | | | 1 | 0.232 | 0.626 | 0.51 | 0.471 | 0.51 | 0.387 | 0.19 | 0.433 | 0.453 | 0.384 | 0.394 | 0.102 | 0.114 | 0.11 | 0.187 | 0.523 |
| EW4 | | | | 1 | 0.375 | 0.577 | 0.419 | 0.482 | 0.339 | 0.327 | 0.487 | 0.335 | 0.188 | 0.44 | 0.4 | 0.36 | 0.244 | 0.32 | 0.294 |
| EW5 | | | | | 1 | 0.627 | 0.499 | 0.449 | 0.394 | 0.258 | 0.334 | 0.471 | 0.277 | 0.319 | 0.314 | 0.236 | 0.203 | 0.407 | 0.57 |
| EW6 | | | | | | 1 | 0.635 | 0.613 | 0.568 | 0.334 | 0.593 | 0.52 | 0.323 | 0.505 | 0.247 | 0.223 | 0.169 | 0.324 | 0.448 |
| EW7 | | | | | | | 1 | 0.578 | 0.535 | 0.481 | 0.356 | 0.594 | 0.341 | 0.338 | 0.198 | 0.26 | 0.448 | 0.419 | 0.396 |
| EW8 | | | | | | | | 1 | 0.535 | 0.195 | 0.346 | 0.578 | 0.29 | 0.458 | 0.221 | 0.411 | 0.364 | 0.385 | 0.525 |
| HPWS1 | | | | | | | | | 1 | 0.566 | 0.578 | 0.495 | 0.336 | 0.595 | 0.317 | 0.268 | 0.216 | 0.298 | 0.306 |
| HPWS2 | | | | | | | | | | 1 | 0.518 | 0.366 | 0.259 | 0.354 | 0.479 | 0.336 | 0.673 | 0.394 | 0.151 |
| HPWS3 | | | | | | | | | | | 1 | 0.424 | 0.215 | 0.48 | 0.416 | 0.359 | 0.252 | 0.337 | 0.235 |
| HPWS4 | | | | | | | | | | | | 1 | 0.405 | 0.332 | 0.349 | 0.473 | 0.417 | 0.561 | 0.474 |
| HPWS5 | | | | | | | | | | | | | 1 | 0.368 | 0.13 | 0.241 | 0.195 | 0.262 | 0.488 |
| WC1 | | | | | | | | | | | | | | 1 | 0.361 | 0.319 | 0.302 | 0.191 | 0.454 |
| WC2 | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | 1 | 0.62 | 0.485 | 0.581 | 0.026 |
| WC3 | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | 1 | 0.562 | 0.597 | 0.271 |
| WC4 | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | 1 | 0.545 | 0.229 |
| WC5 | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | 1 | 0.431 |
| WC6 | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | 1 |

5.2. Mediation Analysis

From the results shown in Tables 4, 5, and 6, High Performance Work System (HPWS), Work Commitment (WC), and Employee Welfare (EW) are all statistically significant variables explored. This study found that there was a strong positive relationship between High Performance Work System (HPWS) and Work Commitment (WC) ($r = 0.71$, $p=0.01$) and Employee Welfare (EW) ($r = 0.56$, $p=0.01$). Additionally, it was discovered that there is a strong, significant, and positive relationship between Work Commitment (WC) and employee welfare (EW) ($r=0.274$, $p=0.01$). In conclusion, the above findings indicate that hypotheses one through 3 are supported by the data. The table also illustrates the impact of Work Commitment (WC) on the correlation between High Performance Work System (HPWS) and Employee Welfare (EW). Table 7 depicts WC as a useful mediator between HPWS and EW, and shows that it provides a powerful, effective, and vital match between the two ($r = 0.197$, $p = 0.01$).

Table 4 Specific indirect effects

| | Original Sample (O) | Sample Mean (M) | Standard Deviation (STDEV) | T O/STDEV | P Values |
|------------------|---------------------|-----------------|----------------------------|-----------|----------|
| HPWS -> WC -> EW | 0.188 | 0.197 | 0.057 | 3.295 | 0.001 |

5.3. Measurement Model

As was indicated in earlier sections, it was proposed to use Smart PLS 3.0 to evaluate the latent constructs of HPWS, WC, and EW. According to [20], Cronbach's alpha and the composite reliability for an exploratory survey should fall between 0.6 and 0.7 (acceptable

levels of internal consistency) to be considered reliable. When the value ranges from 0.7 to 0.9, the results clearly show a satisfying and appropriate range of results for a high level of reliability [20]. Presented in Table 5 is a summary of the results of the measurement of construct validity and reliability in this study.

Table 5 Construct validity and reliability

| | Cronbach's Alpha | rho_A | Composite Reliability | AVE |
|------|------------------|-------|-----------------------|-------|
| EW | 0.899 | 0.906 | 0.919 | 0.588 |
| HPWS | 0.781 | 0.798 | 0.852 | 0.538 |
| WC | 0.799 | 0.797 | 0.856 | 0.501 |

The indication loaded value and the extracted average variance value is used to determine the convergence validity.

To examine the model's convergent validity, the components of each indicator must be more significant than 0.70, and the average variance extracted (AVE) of the latent construct must be higher than 0.50. Based on the results of this study and the values of the AVE for each construct evaluated in the study, the AVE values for each construct are acceptable and sufficient, due to the fact that the AVE value for each construct exceeds 0.50, which is acceptable and sufficient. As shown in Table 6, a comparison of the loading values for each indicator in both latent variables indicates that the value of each indicator of both latent variables is higher than 0.7, implying an appropriate outcome.

Table 6 Indicators' cross loadings

| | Employee Welfare | HPWS | Work Commitment |
|-----|------------------|-------|-----------------|
| EW1 | 0.78 | 0.713 | 0.558 |
| EW2 | 0.823 | 0.624 | 0.624 |
| EW3 | 0.716 | 0.508 | 0.361 |
| EW4 | 0.636 | 0.464 | 0.492 |
| EW5 | 0.74 | 0.484 | 0.499 |

Continuation of Table 6

| | | | |
|-------|-------|-------|-------|
| EW6 | 0.809 | 0.65 | 0.474 |
| EW7 | 0.824 | 0.64 | 0.495 |
| EW8 | 0.783 | 0.495 | 0.572 |
| HPWS1 | 0.619 | 0.821 | 0.49 |
| HPWS2 | 0.442 | 0.732 | 0.552 |
| HPWS3 | 0.575 | 0.756 | 0.496 |
| HPWS4 | 0.677 | 0.767 | 0.62 |
| HPWS5 | 0.406 | 0.765 | 0.415 |
| WC1 | 0.542 | 0.578 | 0.852 |
| WC2 | 0.362 | 0.469 | 0.798 |
| WC3 | 0.397 | 0.467 | 0.774 |
| WC4 | 0.368 | 0.48 | 0.815 |
| WC5 | 0.504 | 0.518 | 0.783 |
| WC6 | 0.594 | 0.45 | 0.807 |

The outcomes of the current research show classifier validity. In Smart PLS, the Fornell-Larcker criterion and value systems introduced in bridging are used to evaluate discriminant validity. It is recommended that, when applying the Fornell-Larcker criterion, connection values with other latent variables should be valued below the square root of AVE to each latent construct. Table 6 shows the indicator's cross-loading calculations for this study, and Table 7 shows the Fornell-Larcker criterion connections within latent constructs.

Table 7 Discriminant validity (Fornell-Larcker criterion)

| | Employee Welfare | HPWS | Work Commitment |
|------|------------------|-------|-----------------|
| EW | 0.767 | | |
| HPWS | 0.756 | 0.733 | |
| WC | 0.671 | 0.709 | 0.708 |

Based on Tables 5, 6, and 7, it is evident that the constructs under investigation are sufficient for both convergent validity and reliability of the constructs investigated. It includes satisfactory AVE (> 0.500), outer loadings (> 0.700), a significant reliability test (> 0.500), and higher levels of internal consistency for each construct (HPWS, Work Commitment, and Employee Welfare) [20].

The findings show that all latent constructs communicate with each other in different ways. Based on the Fornell-Larcker criterion, the study's size met the assessment criteria for discriminant validity based on its cross-loading figures of analysis and it met the criteria for discriminant validity based on the Fornell-Larcker criterion [20].

5.4. Structural Model

The next step in the analysis is to evaluate the structural model's accuracy and reliability using SmartPLS. The coefficient of determination (R^2) is the most critical consideration when determining a structural model's reliability. R^2 reflects the combined effects of external factor loadings on a target endogenous latent construct within the acceptable range of 0 to 1. The greater the value, the greater the model's or research framework's informational power. Table 8 displays the R^2 values for employee welfare

(EW) (0.608) and Work Commitment (WC) (0.502), both of which are solid and beneficial analyses [20].

Table 8 R-square

| | R Square | R Square adjusted |
|----|----------|-------------------|
| EW | 0.608 | 0.604 |
| WC | 0.502 | 0.499 |

When evaluating the transformation in R^2 value for underlying latent structures, f^2 is considered. A heavy workload system (HPWS) had a meaningful, positive, and solid impact on work commitment (WC) (1.008) but only a moderate influence on employee welfare (EW) (0.404). Work Commitment (WC) had a lower effect on employee welfare, with a score of 0.094 (EW).

Table 9 F-square

| | EW | WC |
|------|-------|-------|
| HPWS | 0.404 | 1.008 |
| WC | 0.094 | |

The bootstrap methodology was used to calculate the Confidence Intervals for the associations of latent variables, which disregards any assumptions made regarding the sampling distribution's normality. The correlation value is significant if zero falls outside the lower and higher 95.0% CIs. Table 10 shows no zeros in this study's lower and higher 95.0% CIs.

Table 10 Confidence intervals

| | 2.50% | 97.50% |
|------------|-------|--------|
| HPWS -> EW | 0.437 | 0.664 |
| HPWS -> WC | 0.606 | 0.793 |
| WC -> EW | 0.135 | 0.418 |

Moreover, asserting that a t-value greater than 1.96 and $p \leq 0.05$ illustrates the importance of the path coefficients [20]. According to Table 11, the path coefficients in this study model have a t-value greater than 1.96 and a p-value just under 0.05.

Table 11 Path coefficients

| | Original Sample (O) | Sample Mean (M) | Standard Deviation (STDEV) | T Statistics (O/STDEV) | P Values |
|------------|---------------------|-----------------|----------------------------|------------------------|----------|
| HPWS -> EW | 0.569 | 0.565 | 0.06 | 9.41 | 0.000 |
| HPWS -> WC | 0.708 | 0.713 | 0.049 | 14.536 | 0.000 |
| WC -> EW | 0.266 | 0.274 | 0.07 | 3.799 | 0.000 |

Table 4 shows the impact of HPWS on Employee Welfare (EW), with Work Commitment as a mediator (WC). Results of the study show that the latent variable HPWS can influence EW through the mediator (WC) ($r = 0.197$, $p \leq 0.05$). Hypothesis 3 appears to be supported by the results of this study. To determine how much power has been conferred by WC on mediation, Variance Accounted for (VAF) must be calculated. VAF was found to be 0.2589 in this study,

implying a 25.9% effect of HPWS on EW via WC. Incomplete mediation happens when the mediation falls between 20% and 80%, as per analysis [20]. Mediation was found to be significantly important in the study at 25.9%, which indicates that it plays a mediating role within the range of influence. Work commitment was found to be a matching mediator in this study, considering the preceding discussion.

6. Discussion

A study was performed to assess the impact of HPWS on employee welfare in higher education institutions in Pakistan, with work commitment as a mediator. This study's primary objective was to determine whether academic institutions implement high performance work systems in their procedures. Additionally, we were interested in learning how this affects employee welfare in any educational institution. According to the study's results, these hypotheses are supported. The findings of this study follow previous literature since they examine the reasons why HPWS implementation is successful for both workers and organizations.

Further, the review indicates that employees believe HPWS has benefitted both the organization and its employees, which is consistent with the mutual gain viewpoint. It has been observed that employees tend to decrease their involvement in their job when they realize that HPWS are being implemented to improve the institution's overall effectiveness while ignoring employee welfare [17]. A substantial benchmark has been added to the literature on employee welfare because of the findings of this study. Instructors demonstrate that when effective HR measures are followed for their welfare, they are deeply involved in and committed to their jobs. Through this concept, the study also backs up previous literature that staff members have great joy with their companies if they believe that the HR activities of the firm are mutually advantageous – both in terms of company objectives and employee welfare.

7. Conclusion

Based on theory foundation and rationale, this study builds upon previous studies that sought to identify the key areas of HR characterization studies that influence employee performance. Alternatively, this study focuses on the challenges workers' workplaces face rather than the main effects of human resource identification on employee performance. Additionally, the current study recognizes previous literature on HPWS from a mutual gains perspective. Effective human resource practices enhance employee appreciation and the ability to perform regular duties. As a result, these methods are highly effective. Finally, the study's findings indicate that employees may have a

pleasant experience if HR measures are followed.

7.1. Limitations

It is essential to consider the limitations of this study when evaluating its participation. Due to the time and financial constraints during the pandemic, simultaneous data collection was conducted from respondents, limiting the ability to conclude the study. Furthermore, the study's concepts are all self-reported, which mitigates the typical technique bias. Additionally, only one mediator is considered in this study: Work Commitment. In addition to these constructs, other constructs may be used as mediators [41]. Similarly, innovative leadership designs could be developed as potential moderators [30, 47].

7.2. Future Research Directions

Because of the inclusion of longitudinal data, future studies may be able to enhance this literature review and broaden the scope of the conclusion-drawing process by incorporating longitudinal data. A second possibility is that future research may be able to include additional potential mediators to this study, such as organizational behavior, workplace climate, and workplace harassment. In future, it is planned to expand on this research by including additional leadership concepts, like Servant Leadership, Tolerance Leadership, and Moral Leadership, as moderators with additions to the current model. In the future study, it will also be possible to use objective data collection methods, which will aid in discovering causal effects among latent variables by using longitudinal data collection techniques. To confirm and generalize the findings of the current study, future studies should be conducted in various other sectors and geographical regions.

References

- [1] AKINTOYE E.O., and OFOBRUKU S.A. Staff Welfare Package and Organizational Performance: A Theoretical Discourse. *European Journal of Business and Management Research*, 2022, 7(2). <https://doi.org/10.24018/ejbmr.2022.7.2.1288>
- [2] ANDERSÉN J., and ANDERSÉN A. Are high-performance work systems (HPWS) appreciated by everyone? The role of management position and gender on the relationship between HPWS and affective commitment. *Employee Relations*, 2019, 41(5). <https://doi.org/10.1108/ER-03-2018-0080>
- [3] ANWAR N., NIK MAHMOOD N.H., YUSLIZA M.Y., RAMAYAH T., NOOR FAEZAH J., and KHALID W. Green Human Resource Management for organisational citizenship behaviour towards the environment and environmental performance on a university campus. *Journal of Cleaner Production*, 2020, 256. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jclepro.2020.120401>
- [4] BECKER B.E., and HUSELID M.A. High performance work systems and firm performance: A synthesis of research

- and managerial implications. *Research in Personnel and Human Resources Management*, 1998, 16.
- [5] BECKER B.E., HUSELID M.A., PICKUS P.S., and SPRATT M.F. HR as a source of shareholder value: Research and recommendations. *Human Resource Management*, 1997, 36(1). [https://doi.org/10.1002/\(SICI\)1099-050X\(199721\)36:1<39::AID-HRM8>3.0.CO;2-X](https://doi.org/10.1002/(SICI)1099-050X(199721)36:1<39::AID-HRM8>3.0.CO;2-X)
- [6] BIERSTEDT R., and BLAU P.M. Exchange and Power in Social Life. *American Sociological Review*, 1965, 30(5). <https://doi.org/10.2307/2091154>
- [7] BOS-NEHLES A.C., and MEIJERINK J.G. HRM implementation by multiple HRM actors: a social exchange perspective. *International Journal of Human Resource Management*, 2018, 29(22). <https://doi.org/10.1080/09585192.2018.1443958>
- [8] BOWEN H.R., BOWEN P. G., and GOND J.P. Social responsibilities of the businessman. In: *Social Responsibilities of the Businessman*, 2013. <https://doi.org/10.2307/3708003>
- [9] CHANG P.C., and CHEN S.J. Crossing the level of employee's performance: HPWS, affective commitment, human capital, and employee job performance in professional service organizations. *International Journal of Human Resource Management*, 2011, 22(4). <https://doi.org/10.1080/09585192.2011.555130>
- [10] CHILLAKURI B., and VANKA S. Examining the effects of workplace well-being and high-performance work systems on health harm: a Sustainable HRM perspective. *Society and Business Review*, 2021, 16(1). <https://doi.org/10.1108/SBR-03-2020-0033>
- [11] COMBS J., LIU Y., HALL, A., and KETCHEN D. How much do high-performance work practices matter? A meta-analysis of their effects on organizational performance. *Personnel Psychology*, 2006, 59(3). <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1744-6570.2006.00045.x>
- [12] CROPANZANO R., ANTHONY E.L., DANIELS S.R., and HALL A.V. Social exchange theory: A critical review with theoretical remedies. *Academy of Management Annals*, 2017, 11(1). <https://doi.org/10.5465/annals.2015.0099>
- [13] DEEPROSE D. How to recognize and reward employees: 150 ways to inspire peak performance. In: *Work Smart Series*, 2007.
- [14] DERRICK B., and WHITE P. Comparing two samples from an individual Likert question. *International Journal of Mathematics and Statistics*, 2017, 18(3).
- [15] ELSON D., and PEARSON R. "Nimble Fingers Make Cheap Workers": An Analysis of Women's Employment in Third World Export Manufacturing. *Feminist Review*, 1981, 7. <https://doi.org/10.2307/1394761>
- [16] FRAGOSO P., CHAMBE, M.J., and CASTANHEIRA F. High-performance work systems (HPWS) and individual performance: The mediating role of commitment. *Military Psychology*, 2021. <https://doi.org/10.1080/08995605.2021.2010429>
- [17] GAN SHI, CHAIR CAO, and WANG. Willingness of Chinese nurses to practice in Hubei combating the coronavirus disease 2019 epidemic: A cross-sectional study. *Journal of advanced nursing*, 2020, 76(8), 2137-2150.
- [18] HAIR F.J., RINGLE M.C., and SARSTEDT M. Partial Least Squares Structural Equation Modeling. *Handbook of market research*, 2017, 26(1), 1-40.
- [19] HAIR R., and SARSTEDT. Partial least squares: the better approach to structural equation modeling. *Long Range Planning*, 2012, 45, 312-319.
- [20] HAIR J.F., RISHER J.J., SARSTEDT M., and RINGLE C.M. When to use and how to report the results of PLS-SEM. *European Business Review*, 2019, 31(1). <https://doi.org/10.1108/EBR-11-2018-0203>
- [21] HEFFERNAN M., and DUNDON T. Cross-level effects of high-performance work systems (HPWS) and employee well-being: The mediating effect of organisational justice. *Human Resource Management Journal*, 2016, 26(2). <https://doi.org/10.1111/1748-8583.12095>
- [22] HUSIN N.H., NAHA N., MANSOR A., WIDARMAN B., and KELANA Y. The Influence of High Performance Work Systems (HPWS) On Innovative Work Behaviour Through Work Engagement. *Journal of Contemporary Issues* 2021, 27(2).
- [23] ILIE VERMUNT, and BROWN. The role of reasoning ability in university students' cognitive and metacognitive development. In: ESTERHAZY R., BRAUN E., and KORDTS-FREUNDINGER, R. (eds.). *Higher Education learning*. Waxmann, Berlin, 2020.
- [24] IVERSON R.D., and ZATZICK C.D. The effects of downsizing on labor productivity: The value of showing consideration for employees' morale and welfare in high-performance work systems. *Human Resource Management*, 2011, 50(1). <https://doi.org/10.1002/hrm.20407>
- [25] JIANG K., LEPAK D.P., HU J., and BAER J.C. How does human resource management influence organizational outcomes? A meta-analytic investigation of mediating mechanisms. *Academy of Management Journal*, 2012, 55(6). <https://doi.org/10.5465/amj.2011.0088>
- [26] KLOUTSINIOTIS P.V., and MIHAIL D.M. The effects of high performance work systems in employees' service-oriented OCB. *International Journal of Hospitality Management*, 2020, 90. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ijhm.2020.102610>
- [27] LEPAK D.P., and SNELL S.A. Examining the human resource architecture: The relationships among human capital, employment, and human resource configurations. *Journal of Management*, 2002, 28(4). [https://doi.org/10.1016/S0149-2063\(02\)00142-3](https://doi.org/10.1016/S0149-2063(02)00142-3)
- [28] LIAO H., TOYA K., LEPAK D.P., and HONG Y. Do They See Eye to Eye? Management and Employee Perspectives of High-Performance Work Systems and Influence Processes on Service Quality. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 2009, 94(2). <https://doi.org/10.1037/a0013504>
- [29] MASIH L.K. Career Saliency and Its Relation to Certain Needs, Interests, and Job Values. *The Personnel and Guidance Journal*, 1967, 45(7). <https://doi.org/10.1002/j.2164-4918.1967.tb04562.x>
- [30] MIAO R., and CAO Y. High-performance work system, work well-being, and employee creativity: Cross-level moderating role of transformational leadership. *International Journal of Environmental Research and Public Health*, 2019, 16(9). <https://doi.org/10.3390/ijerph16091640>
- [31] NADEEM K., RIAZ A., IFTIKHAR Y., AHMAD, M.B., and SHAMSHAD W. Influence of High-Performance Work System on Employee Service Performance and OCB: The Mediating Role of PsyCap. *Issues in Economics and Business*, 2019, 5(2). <https://doi.org/10.5296/ieb.v5i2.15009>
- [32] RAINERI A. Linking human resources practices with performance: the simultaneous mediation of collective affective commitment and human capital. *International Journal of Human Resource Management*, 2017, 28(22). <https://doi.org/10.1080/09585192.2016.1155163>

- [33] RIAZ A., and MAHMOOD H. Cross-level relationship of implemented high performance work system and employee service outcomes: The mediating role of affective commitment. *Pakistan Journal of Commerce and Social Sciences (PJCSS)*, 2017, 11(1).
- [34] SARSTEDT M., RINGLE C.M., and HAIR J.F. Partial Least Squares Structural Equation Modeling Marko. *Handbook of Market Research*. In: *Handbook of Market Research*, 2017.
- [35] SAUNDERS M.A., and LEWIS P. Research Methods for Business Students Eighth Edition Research Methods for Business Students. In: *Research Methods for Business Students*, 2019.
- [36] SHIH H.A., CHIANG Y.H., and HSU C.C. High performance work system and HCN performance. *Journal of Business Research*, 2013, 66(4). <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jbusres.2012.01.002>
- [37] SIDDIQUE M., PROCTER S., and GITTELL J.H. The role of relational coordination in the relationship between high-performance work systems (HPWS) and organizational performance. *Journal of Organizational Effectiveness*, 2019, 6(4). <https://doi.org/10.1108/JOEPP-04-2018-0029>
- [38] STIGLITZ J.E., and SEN A. The Measurement of Economic Performance and Social Progress Revisited Reflections and Overview. *LOFCE Working Papers*, 2009, 33.
- [39] SWINTON K., and WEILER P.C. Governing the Workplace: The Future of Labor and Employment Law. *Canadian Public Policy*, 1991, 17(2). <https://doi.org/10.2307/3551039>
- [40] TAKEUCHI R., LEPAK D.P., WANG H., and TAKEUCHI K. An Empirical Examination of the Mechanisms Mediating Between High-Performance Work Systems and the Performance of Japanese Organizations. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 2007, 92(4). <https://doi.org/10.1037/0021-9010.92.4.1069>
- [41] TEO S.T.T., BENTLEY T., and NGUYEN D. Psychosocial work environment, work engagement, and employee commitment: A moderated, mediation model. *International Journal of Hospitality Management*, 2020, 88. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ijhm.2019.102415>
- [42] THORSEN D.E., and LIE A. What is Neoliberalism? *University of Oslo Magazine*, 2006.
- [43] VALLAS S.P. Why teamwork fails: Obstacles to workplace change in four manufacturing plants. *American Sociological Review*, 2003, 68(2). <https://doi.org/10.2307/1519767>
- [44] VAN BEURDEN J., VAN DE VOORDE K., and VAN VELDHoven M. The employee perspective on HR practices: A systematic literature review, integration and outlook. *International Journal of Human Resource Management*, 2021, 32(2). <https://doi.org/10.1080/09585192.2020.1759671>
- [45] WAHID I.S., and HYAMS-SSEKASI D. Impact of HPWS on employees' performance within the Bangladeshi telecom sector. *Journal for Global Business Advancement*, 2018, 11(4). <https://doi.org/10.1504/JGBA.2018.097181>
- [46] ZHAI X., and TIAN X. An institutional view on the relationship between high-performance work system and organizational performance: the role of country of origin. *Personnel Review*, 2022, Ahead-of-print. <https://doi.org/10.1108/PR-06-2019-0334>
- [47] ZHANG LIN, LIU CHEN, and LIU. How do human resource management practices affect Employee Welfare? A mediated moderation model. *Employee Relations. The International Journal*, 2020, 42(4), 903-919.

參考文:

- [1] AKINTOYE E.O. 和 OFOBRUKU S.A. 員工福利包和組織績效：理論論述。歐洲商業與管理研究雜誌，2022年，7(2)。 <https://doi.org/10.24018/ejbmr.2022.7.2.1288>
- [2] ANDERSÉN J. 和 ANDERSÉN A. 高性能工作系統(高績效工作制度)是否受到所有人的讚賞？管理職位和性別對高績效工作制度與情感承諾關係的作用。員工關係，2019年，41(5)。 <https://doi.org/10.1108/ER-03-2018-0080>
- [3] ANWAR N., NIK MAHMOOD N.H., YUSLIZA M.Y., RAMAYAH T., NOOR FAEZAH J. 和 KHALID W. 綠色人力資源管理，用於大學校園環境和環境績效的組織公民行為。清潔生產雜誌，2020，256。 <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jclepro.2020.120401>
- [4] BECKER B.E. 和 HUSELID M.A. 高績效工作系統和公司績效：研究和管理影響的綜合。人事與人力資源管理研究，1998，16。
- [5] BECKER B.E., HUSELID M.A., PICKUS P.S. 和 SPRATT M.F. 人力資源作為股東價值的來源：研究和建議。人力資源管理，1997，36(1)。 [https://doi.org/10.1002/\(SICI\)1099-050X\(199721\)36:1<39::AID-HRM8>3.0.CO;2-X](https://doi.org/10.1002/(SICI)1099-050X(199721)36:1<39::AID-HRM8>3.0.CO;2-X)
- [6] BIERSTEDT R. 和 BLAU P.M. 社會生活中的交流與權力。美國社會學評論，1965，30(5)。 <https://doi.org/10.2307/2091154>
- [7] BOS-NEHLES A.C. 和 MEIJERINK J.G. 多個人力資源管理參與者實施人力資源管理：社會交換視角。國際人力資源管理雜誌，2018，29(22)。 <https://doi.org/10.1080/09585192.2018.1443958>
- [8] BOWEN H.R., BOWEN P.G. 和 GOND J.P. 商人的社會責任。在：商人的社會責任，2013年。 <https://doi.org/10.2307/3708003>
- [9] CHANG P.C., 和 CHEN S.J. 跨越員工績效水平：高績效工作制度、情感承諾、人力資本和專業服務組織中的員工工作績效。國際人力資源管理雜誌，2011，22(4)。 <https://doi.org/10.1080/09585192.2011.555130>
- [10] CHILLAKURI B. 和 VANKA S. 檢查工作場所福利和高績效工作系統對健康危害的影響：可持續的人力資源管理視角。社會與商業評論，2021年，16(1)。 <https://doi.org/10.1108/SBR-03-2020-0033>
- [11] COMBS J., LIU Y., HALL, A. 和 KETCHEN D. 高績效工作實踐有多重要？對它們對組織績效影響的薈萃分析。人事心理學，2006，59(3)。 <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1744-6570.2006.00045.x>
- [12] CROPANZANO R., ANTHONY E.L., DANIELS S.R., 和 HALL A.V. 社會交換理論：具有理論補救措施的批判性評論。管理

學會年鑑, 2017, 11(1). <https://doi.org/10.5465/annals.2015.0099>

[13] DEEPROSE D. 如何表彰和獎勵員工：激發最佳績效的150種方法。在：智能工作系列, 2007年。

[14] DERRICK B. 和 WHITE P. 比較來自單個李克特問題的兩個樣本。國際數學與統計雜誌, 2017, 18 (3)。

[15] ELSON D. 和 PEARSON R. “靈活的手指造就廉價工人”：對第三世界出口製造業中女性就業的分析。女權主義評論, 1981, 7.

<https://doi.org/10.2307/1394761>

[16] FRAGOSO P., CHAMBE, M.J. 和 CASTANHEIRA F.

高績效工作系統和個人績效：承諾的中介作用。軍事心理學, 2021. <https://doi.org/10.1080/08995605.2021.2010429>

[17] GAN SHI, CHAIR CAO, 和 WANG. 中國護士在湖北實踐抗擊2019年冠狀病毒病流行的意願：一項橫斷面研究。高級護理雜誌, 2020, 76(8), 2137-2150.

[18] HAIR F.J., RINGLE M.C. 和 SARSTEDT M. 偏最小二乘結構方程建模。市場研究手冊, 2017, 26(1), 1-40.

[19] HAIR R. 和 SARSTEDT. 偏最小二乘：結構方程建模的更好方法。長期規劃, 2012, 45, 312-319.

[20] HAIR J.F., RISHER J.J., SARSTEDT M. 和 RINGLE C.M. 何時使用以及如何報告偏最小二乘結構方程建模的結果。歐洲商業評論, 2019, 31(1). <https://doi.org/10.1108/EBR-11-2018-0203>

[21] HEFFERNAN M. 和 DUNDON T. 高績效工作系統和員工幸福感的跨層次效應：組織公正的中介效應。人力資源管理雜誌, 2016, 26(2). <https://doi.org/10.1111/1748-8583.12095>

[22] HUSIN N.H., NAHA N., MANSOR A., WIDARMAN B. 和 KELANA Y. 高性能工作系統通過工作投入對創新工作行為的影響。當代問題雜誌 2021, 27(2)。

[23] ILIE VERMUNT 和 BROWN. 推理能力在大學生認知和元認知發展中的作用。在：ESTERHAZY R., BRAUN E., 和 KORDTS-FREUNDINGER, R. (編輯)。高等教育學習。蠟人, 柏林, 2020。

[24] IVERSON R.D. 和 ZATZICK C.D. 裁員對勞動生產率的影響：在高績效工作系統中考慮員工士氣和福利的價值。人力資源管理, 2011, 50(1). <https://doi.org/10.1002/hrm.20407>

[25] JIANG K., LEPAK D.P., HU J. 和 BAER J.C. 人力資源管理如何影響組織成果？中介機制的薈萃分析研究。管理學院學報, 2012, 55(6). <https://doi.org/10.5465/amj.2011.0088>

[26] KLOUTSINIOTIS P.V. 和 MIHAIL D.M. 高績效工作系統對員工服務型OCB的影響。國際酒店管理雜誌, 2020, 90. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ijhm.2020.102610>

[27] LEPAK D.P. 和 SNELL S.A.

檢查人力資源架構：人力資本、就業和人力資源配置之間的關係。管理雜誌, 2002, 28 (4) 。 [https://doi.org/10.1016/S0149-2063\(02\)00142-3](https://doi.org/10.1016/S0149-2063(02)00142-3)

[28] LAO H., TOYA K., LEPAK D.P. 和 HONG Y. 他們意見一致嗎？高性能工作系統的管理和員工觀點以及對服務質量的影響流程。應用心理學雜誌, 2009, 94 (2) 。 <https://doi.org/10.1037/a0013504>

[29] MASIH L.K. 職業顯著性及其與某些需求、興趣和工作價值觀的關係。人事與指導雜誌, 1967年, 45(7). <https://doi.org/10.1002/j.2164-4918.1967.tb04562.x>

[30] MIAO R., 和 CAO Y. 高績效工作制度、工作幸福感與員工創造力：變革型領導的跨層次調節作用。國際環境研究與公共衛生雜誌, 2019, 16(9). <https://doi.org/10.3390/ijerph16091640>

[31] NADEEM K., RIAZ A., IFTIKHAR Y., AHMAD, M.B. 和 SHAMSHAD W. 高績效工作系統對員工服務績效和華僑銀行的影響：心理資本的中介作用。經濟與商業問題, 2019年, 5(2). <https://doi.org/10.5296/ieb.v5i2.15009>

[32] RAINERI A. 將人力資源實踐與績效聯繫起來：集體情感承諾和人力資本的同時調節。國際人力資源管理雜誌, 2017, 28(22). <https://doi.org/10.1080/09585192.2016.1155163>

[33] RIAZ A. 和 MAHMOOD H. 實施的高績效工作系統與員工服務成果的跨層次關係：情感承諾的中介作用。巴基斯坦商業與社會科學雜誌(PJ CSS), 2017, 11(1)。

[34] SARSTEDT M., RINGLE C.M. 和 HAIR J.F. 偏最小二乘結構方程建模马尔科。市場研究手冊。見：市場研究手冊, 2017年。

[35] SAUNDERS M.A. 和 LEWIS P. 商科學生研究方法 8 版商科學生研究方法。在：商科學生的研究方法, 2019 。

[36] SHIH H.A., CHIANG Y.H. 和 HSU C.C. 高性能工作系統和HCN性能。商業研究雜誌, 2013, 66(4). <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jbusres.2012.01.002>

[37] SIDDIQUE M., PROCTER S. 和 GITTELL J.H. 關係協調在高性能工作系統和組織績效之間的關係中的作用。組織效能雜誌, 2019, 6(4). <https://doi.org/10.1108/JOEPP-04-2018-0029>

[38] STIGLITZ J.E. 和 SEN A. 經濟績效和社會進步的衡量重新審視反思和概述。LOFC E工作論文, 2009年, 第33頁。

[39] SWINTON K. 和 WEILER P.C. 管理工作場所：勞動和就業法的未來。加拿大公共政策, 1991, 17(2). <https://doi.org/10.2307/3551039>

[40] TAKEUCHI R., LEPAK D.P., WANG H. 和 TAKEUCHI K. 對高績效工作系統與日本組織績效之間中介機制的實證檢驗。應用心理學雜誌, 2007, 92 (4) 。 <https://doi.org/10.1037/0021-9010.92.4.1069>

[41] TEO S.T.T., BENTLEY T. 和 NGUYEN D. 心理社會工作環境、工作投入和員工承諾：一種有節制的調解模型。國際酒店管理雜誌, 2020, 88. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ijhm.2019.102415>

[42] THORSEN D.E. 和 LIE A.

什麼是新自由主義？奧斯陸大學雜誌，2006年。

[43] VALLAS S.P.

為什麼團隊合作會失敗：四家製造廠改變工作場所的障礙。美國社會學評論，2003，68(2)。 <https://doi.org/10.2307/1519767>

[44] VAN BEURDEN J.、VAN DE VOORDE K. 和 VAN VELDHOVEN M.

員工對人力資源實踐的看法：系統的文獻回顧、整合和展望。國際人力資源管理雜誌，2021，32(2)。 <https://doi.org/10.1080/09585192.2020.1759671>

[45] WAHID I.S. 和 HYAMS-SSEKASI D. 高績效工作制度

對孟加拉國電信部門員工績效的影響。全球商業發展雜誌，2018年，11(4)。 <https://doi.org/10.1504/JGBA.2018.097181>

[46] ZHAI X. 和 TIAN X.

高績效工作制度與組織績效關係的製度觀：原籍國的作用。人事審查，2022年，提前印刷。 <https://doi.org/10.1108/PR-06-2019-0334>

[47] ZHANG LIN, LIU CHEN, 和 LIU.

人力資源管理實踐如何影響員工福利？介導的調節模型。職員之間的關係。國際期刊，2020，42(4)，903-919。