HIGH PERFORMANCE WORK SYTEMS AND ORGANIZATIONAL COMMITMENT: A LITERATURE REVIEW

[1]Shashibhushan , [2]Dr Rajkumar Singh

[1]Research Scholar [2]Assistant Professor

Department of Commerce, C. M. P. Degree College (University of Allahabad), Prayagraj, India

Abstract: Every organization is interested in creating high performing workplaces where there is a pervasive performance work culture, people perform because they would like to perform better, and the organizational policies and practices help them in aligning their individual goals to organizational goals. High Performance Work Systems have been increasingly important in commercial competition in recent decades. This study seeks to evaluate how high-performance work systems contribute to organizational commitment when business environment change is the principal cause of external challenges. This study is useful for practitioners because it acknowledges the benefits of High-Performance Work Systems action for organizations and how it can be a source of organizational commitment for the organization. This document provides significant guidance to general managers and human resource managers in maintaining High-Performance Work Systems (HPWS) in order to achieve and maintain organizational commitment. It also looks at how HPWS impacts organizational commitment and the primary characteristics that drive organizational commitment, such as work satisfaction, leadership style, and organizational environment. The purpose of this paper is to list all of the aspects that influence organizational commitment. As a result, they can retain and improve employee performance and company efficiency. The primary elements impacting job satisfaction include the working environment, working conditions, compensation management, promotion opportunities, job security, relationship with manager, relationship with coworkers, and management-employee connection. Employees will be more dedicated to their organization if their leaders exhibit transformational leadership behaviors.

Keywords: Promotion opportunities, Compensation management, Organizational commitment, High-Performance Work Systems, Organizational climate.

1. INTRODUCTION

For decades, high-performance work systems (HPWS) have piqued the curiosity of those studying organizational behaviour. HPWS are distinguished by a set of management practices and policies that are aimed to enhance employee engagement, autonomy, and skill development, which, in turn, hold the key to attaining sustainable competitive advantage and long-term organizational success (**Becker and Huselid, 1998**). These systems are expected to have a favourable influence on corporate performance, employee well-being, and overall sustainability (**Huang, Ahlstrom, Lee, Chen and Hsieh, 2016**).

Deloitte report (2019) said that the primary function of human resources experts is to allow and improve employee productivity. HPWS helps to improve productivity by building employee competency (ability), offering empowerment, and earning rewards (motivation). **(Edgar et al., 2020; Ananthram et al., 2018; Lawler, 1986)**.

A typical high-performance system has a constant alignment between individual HR practices and the organization's objectives **(Evan and Davis, 2005; Huselid and Becker, 1995)**. It aids in creating a 'fit' between people, work, processes, and information. The process of knowledge generation inside the business is heavily reliant on employees' abilities to find, organize, and evaluate data. HPWS helps employees enhance their learning and performance, allowing them to gain and exchange information with external sources **(Zheng et al, 2020)**.

As a result, understanding the function of HPWS in ensuring industrial sustainability has become even more important. Despite the relevance of this issue, there is little research on the function of HPWS in achieving long-term competitive advantage in the manufacturing business. This literature review will be useful for managers and practitioners looking to adopt HPWS in their businesses, as well as scholars interested in understanding the role of HPWS in maintaining an organization's competitive edge over time.

HPWS Background and Meaning:

The concept of HPWS emerged in the field of strategic human resource management. During the 1980s, several industries around the world employed their work systems to increase staff productivity. Japan was leading with its lean manufacturing method, Sweden with its socio-technical systems, and Germany with its diverse quality production. The United States was determined to be behind in this domain. **Applebaum and Batt (1995)** argued in their book The New American Workplace that the United States should reinvent its form of the advanced work system in order to compete in global markets. This resulted in the creation of HPWS.

High-performance work systems (HPWS) are described as a specialized set of human resource practices, work structures, and procedures that optimize employee knowledge, abilities, dedication, and flexibility **(Datta et al., 2005).** HPWS is formed from a set of human resource management systems that comprise human resource policies, practices, and processes that may be related to results at both the employee and organizational levels **(Cafferkey and Dundon, 2015).**

Prior to HPWS, the literature was mostly concerned with the relationship between human resource management and employee and organizational performance. HPWS employs flat organizational structures to provide employees with comprehensive training, safe environments, management and competitive compensation, organizational identification, and productivity, resulting in long-term competitive advantages and individual and organizational development **(Pak and Kim 2016).**

Huselid's (1995) study on human resource practices provided a framework for integrating human resource practices into bundles and aligning them with organizational strategy, which was referred to as HPWS. It is a system that connects a number of human resource processes. Furthermore, it is consistent with the organizational plan (**Huselid and Becker, 1995**). The synergistic impact provided by this arrangement improves the efficiency of work practices and personnel in terms of skills, dedication, and productivity, allowing the business to achieve better outcomes and gain a sustained competitive edge. HPWS is described by Evans and **Davis (2015)** "as an integrated system of HR practices that are internally consistent (alignment among HR practices) and externally consistent (alignment with organizational strategy)". For example, the business should be able to build a seamless communication system that shares the organization's goal, vision, culture, and strategy while also providing a feedback mechanism. HR practices such as selecting candidates with the right skills for the right job, evaluating employee performance based on organizational goals, paying compensation based on performance by linking bonuses, rewards, and incentives to performance, and extensive training of appropriate skills and knowledge to fill skill gaps and keep human capital up to date should all be aligned with the organization's strategy. These behaviours should complement one another. Properly aligned HR policies improve the effectiveness of both the business and the personnel.

Finally, there is an independent variable: work and employment practices considered to be part of a high-performance system. These are susceptible to a bewildering diversity of definitions and claims. **Becker and Gerhart (1996)**, in a table of five significant HPWS studies done in the United States, demonstrated the range of views of important HR practices as early as the mid-1990s.

Main perspectives that HPWS study will focus on:

High-performance work systems (HPWS) are widely acknowledged as a critical driver of organizational performance and competitiveness **(Fu et al., 2015; Kling, 1995; Macduffie, 1995).** Sustainability, on the other hand, refers to the persistence of systems and processes. The notion spread throughout time to a number of industries, and it is currently frequently employed in business. Sustainability has emerged as an important subject in both the commercial and academic worlds. Sustainability is especially crucial in business since it ensures an organization's long-term stability and competitive viability **(Chillakuri and Vanka, 2020).** In summary, the sustainability of HPWS is dependent on firms recognizing their employees' needs and developing long-term policies and processes to reinforce their values and principles through improved employee engagement and involvement **(Gollan 2005).** Research on the function of HPWS in manufacturing industry sustainability has mostly focused on two perspectives: the organizational view and the person perspective **(Kaushik and Mukherjee, 2022; Suchitra, Sasmita, and Padma, 2019; Zhang et al., 2018; Marathe and Pathak, 2013).**

Organizational perspective

From an organizational standpoint, scholars have explored the elements that contribute to the long-term sustainability of industry using HPWS **(Becker and Gerhart, 1996; Huselid, 1995; Tannenbaum and Dupuree-Bruno, 1994).** To begin with, corporate culture and leadership both have an impact on sustainability. According to research, firms with a strong culture of innovation, continuous development, and employee participation are more likely to succeed over time **(Al-Ajlouni, 2021; Zhou, Fan, & Son, 2019).** Furthermore, leadership is key to HPWS's long-term survival because it provides essential support and resources, fosters a healthy organizational culture, and encourages employee participation **(Sun and Mamman, 2022; Lee, Lee, and Sohn, 2017).**

Another organizational component is the necessity of structure and processes in ensuring long-term sustainability. According to research, the design of the organizational structure and procedures, such as decision-making processes, communication channels, and information systems, may have a significant impact on a company's long-term viability **(Zhu, Liu, and Chen, 2018; Sienknecht and Van Aken, 2002).** Flat, decentralized, and flexible organizational structures are more likely to sustain HPWS over time because they provide employees greater autonomy, involvement, and decision-making power **(Tannenbaum & Dupuree-Bruno, 1994).**

Sustainability study has also looked at how human resource management (HRM) practices contribute to the long-term viability of the manufacturing business. According to studies, integrating HRM practices with the organization's strategic goals is critical to HPWS's long-term survival **(Jeong and Choi, 2016; Posthuma, Campion, and Masimova, 2013).**

Individual perspective

Researchers have examined the elements that impact HPWS and organizational sustainability from the perspective of employees **(Michael and Alex, 2019; Zhang et al., 2018; Harley, Sargent, and Allen, 2011; Huselid and Becker, 1995).** One of the key conclusions is that employee engagement and empowerment are crucial to the organization's long-term viability **(Yufang, Zhenzhong and Yong, 2017; Arefin, Raquib, and Arif, 2015).**

According to research, personnel who participate in the design and deployment of HPWS are more likely to support and maintain these systems over time **(Varma et al., 1999).** Furthermore, employee empowerment, which refers to employees' autonomy and control over their job, has been proven to be

favourably linked with HPWS's long-term viability **(Para-González et al., 2019).** Furthermore, attempts to draw attention to the association between psychological empowerment and HPWS have resulted in confirmation of the strong relationship. These findings also demonstrate that organizational empowerment can contribute to the HPWS's sustainability **(Park, 2020; Arefin et al., 2019; Rabia and Afsheen, 2015).**

Overall, the literature demonstrates that an organization's sustainability is impacted by both organizational and individual characteristics. Leadership and culture, as well as employee participation and empowerment, are crucial for an organization's long-term success. **Suryaningtyas and Irawanto (2019)** discovered that external variables such as economic circumstances, competition, and technological development may all have an impact on an organization's sustainability. They believe that by using HPWS, firms may achieve sustainability by providing training that improves adaptability and instilling values in their personnel. This allows firms to efficiently respond to external changes and impediments, such as innovative technologies **(Kaushik and Mukherjee, 2022).**

Organizational commitment Meaning:

Lotanz and Shave (1992) described organizational commitment as a strong desire to stay with the organization, a willingness to go above and beyond for the organization, and a strong belief in the organization's values and objectives **(Khanifar et al. 2012).** Organizational commitment consists of three components: affective, continuous, and normative. Affective commitment is defined by a strong emotional connection to and engagement in the organization.

- Continuance commitment involves recognizing the ramifications of leaving the firm.
- Normative commitment involves remaining a member of an organization **(Jena, 2015).**

The most important factors impacting organizational commitment are age, gender, education level, and marital status. According to Allen and Meyer, older workers have better job satisfaction because they are more dedicated. According to certain studies, women are more committed to organizations than men, although the difference is small. Organizational commitment may be defined as dedication to the organization, dedication to the task, commitment to consumers, commitment to superiors, or commitment to management. An increasing amount of research examines the factors that impact organizational commitment.

2. LITERATURE REVIEW

Halis and Gokgoz (2007) Internal customer job satisfaction was utilized to measure organizational commitment. They concluded that internal customer satisfaction with business policies, pay systems, working conditions, and happiness with company growth were strongly related to organizational commitment.

Hong et al. (2013) investigated the factors that influenced employee satisfaction at a facility in Seremban, Malaysia. This research suggests that the work environment, remuneration, and promotion principles have a stronger impact on job satisfaction. On the other side, corporate fairness has a minimal impact on job satisfaction.

Parvin and Kabir (2011) analyzed Employee job satisfaction in the pharmaceutical industry is determined by a few factors. According to his research, the most important factors influencing employee job satisfaction in the pharmaceutical industry are working conditions, compensation and promotion, fairness, job security, colleague connections, and supervisor relationships. However, observations in the pharmaceutical industry show that employee job satisfaction is neutral (neither delighted nor unsatisfied) when it comes to working conditions, salary and promotion, job security, and colleague relationships. Employee work satisfaction is slightly lower in their relationship with their immediate boss.

Neog and Barua (2014) Observed the factors influencing job satisfaction among employees at automobile service workshops in Assam. According to 37% of respondents in this research, money is the most significant factor influencing employee job satisfaction. Work-life balance was highlighted by 29% of respondents, supervisory support by 19%, and career opportunities by 15%.

Salunke (2015) undertook a research to investigate the relationship between the work environment and employee job satisfaction in the cooperative sugar industry. This study found that favourable working circumstances, such as fun at work, health and safety facilities, and refreshment and leisure facilities, increase job satisfaction. Stress, overtime, load, fatigue, and boredom, on the other hand, contribute to work dissatisfaction.

Bakotic and Babic (2013) At Croatian Shipbuilding Company, we investigated the relationship between working conditions and job satisfaction. According to empirical studies, employees in administration are more satisfied with their working conditions than those in harsh working conditions. As a result, improving working conditions is crucial for individuals who work in dangerous situations.

3. OBJEVTIVE

To investigate the various HPWS techniques used by the company to promote organizational commitment.

4. FACTORS OF HPWS AND ORGANIZATIONAL COMMITMENT

HPWS, through the variables utilized in this study (organizational commitment, work-life balance and work intensification, job satisfaction and relationships with management, and employee engagement), may be examined to provide a contribution to commitment for enterprises or organizations.

High Performance Work Systems:

As previously stated, advocates feel that HPWS has a favourable impact on employee dedication, which leads to improved performance. As a result, this section of the study will seek to determine what the true effect is, whether good or negative. Prior research on turnover has investigated the factors of both individual employee exits and aggregate organizational turnover **(Huselid, 1995)**. Previous research concluded that perceptions of job security, the presence of a union, job satisfaction, organizational tenure, demographic variables such as age, gender, education, and number of dependents, organizational commitment, whether a job meets an individual's expectations, and the expressed intention to seek another job were all predictive of employees' decision to leave **(Arnold and Feldman, 1982; Cotton and Tuttle, 1986)**.

Arthur (1994) examined performance improvements from increased commitment and any consequent churn. These findings showed an 'apparent' statistically significant connection between dedication and performance. The difficulty here is that the human resource system variable in this model, which demonstrates a considerable link between commitment and performance, should be read with caution.

Work-Life Balance and Work Intensification:

Throughout the research, it is claimed that HPWS improves employee discretion **(White et al., 2003; Harley, 2002)**. There are assertions that specific behaviours, such as group work and team formation, contribute to this favourable effect. The term 'discretion' refers to employees' capacity to make excellent decisions, be cautious, and have flexibility of choice **(Harley, 2002)**. **Harley (2002)** found that HPWS improves discretion. The findings revealed a substantial and favourable correlation with team development, which was validated by **White et al. (2003).**

The objective of highlighting this link is to demonstrate how more discretion may have ramifications outside of the job **White et al. (2003)** investigate this idea by delving into the influence that working hours and certain high-performance strategies have on negative job-to-home spillover.

Work intensification refers to not just the longer hours that a person works but also the pressure that comes with having a more highly skilled workforce **(Green, 2001).** When looking at work intensification solely in terms of increasing hours, it is worth noting that individuals work significantly fewer hours than they did shortly after WWII **(Green 2001).** Furthermore, in recent years, the average number of hours worked has only slightly increased **(Green, 2001).**

Job Satisfaction and Relations with Management:

According to Harley (2002), the HPWS practice of quality circles was connected with higher work satisfaction levels. To analyze the impact of quality circles on work satisfaction, it is necessary to first define them. Quality Circles are often characterized as "small groups of volunteers from the same work area who meet on a regular basis to identify, analyze, and resolve quality and related problems in their area of responsibility" **(Griffin, 1988).**

Further supporting evidence of an increase in job satisfaction as a result of quality circles comes from **Griffin (1988)**, who discovered that quality circles had a moderately positive increase in job satisfaction over time, resulting in improved organizational performance. It is crucial to note, however, that this growth was not sustained over time and eventually reverted to its previous level. This implies that quality circles have a beneficial influence on work satisfaction, but only in the short term.

Employee engagement:

Employee involvement has been acknowledged as a critical aspect of the long-term success of HPWS and the manufacturing industry. Employees who are engaged are more likely to be devoted to the organization and go above and beyond their work responsibilities to help it accomplish its objectives **(Mushtaq, Saleem, and Bakhtawar, 2022)**. According to certain research, HPWS can boost employee engagement by allowing employees to grow their skills, gain autonomy, and participate in decision-making. Furthermore, engaged personnel are more likely to stay with the business in the long run, which can help secure its sustainability **(Oliveira and Aguiar da Silva, 2015).** Employee involvement may also be maintained over time by providing possibilities for professional development and advancement **(Edgar, Zhang, and Blaker, 2021; Gollan, 2005).** Academic research on employee engagement and HPWS has concluded that good communication, transparency, and a happy work environment are critical aspects that can enhance employee engagement and contribute to an organization's long-term success **(Saini, 2015).** Research has also shown that including employees in the design and implementation of HPWS may boost their buy-in and commitment to the system, resulting in better levels of employee engagement.

HPWS has been shown to boost employee knowledge, skills, motivation, and engagement in a variety of ways, hence contributing to the industry's long-term profitability and sustainability **(Afonso et al., 2021).** Implementing training and development programs is one-way HPWS increases staff knowledge and competencies **(Hassett, 2022).** These programs provide employees with the knowledge and skills they need to do their jobs effectively, increasing their excitement and involvement. HPWS also increases employee engagement by providing greater autonomy and control over their work **(Mattersah, 2019).** This might be accomplished through tactics such as self-managed teams, employee participation in decision-making, and performance-based incentives **(Peprah, 2020; Evans and Davis, 2005).** Giving workers more autonomy and control over their work increases job satisfaction and motivation, which adds to the organization's long-term viability **(Afonso et al., 2021).** HPWS also increases employee involvement by allowing employees to participate in the design and deployment of the systems.

Organizational Commitment factors:

The major determining variables of organizational commitment are:

- Job satisfaction
- Leadership style
- Organization climate

Job satisfaction

Employees' attitudes toward working environments that suit their needs and ideals, as well as their responses to those environments, Job satisfaction is the major element that influences organizational commitment **(Gangai 2015).**

Leadership styles

It refers to the behavioural technique used by leaders to influence, inspire, and guide their subordinates. Leadership styles include transformative leadership, transactional leadership, laissez-faire leadership, and ethical leadership.

Organizational climate

Is a permanent feature of an organization's internal environment that its workers feel and are affected by their behaviour; moreover, this climate may be expressed in terms of the values of a certain set of traits (or attitudes) of the organization. Organizational climate is inextricably linked to all operations inside an organization, whether directly or indirectly. In today's competitive business environment, an organization's survival and growth are dependent on a favourable organizational climate. A positive organizational atmosphere improves work satisfaction **(Singh et al. 2011).**

5. RELATIONSHIP BETWEEN HPWS AND ORGANIZATIONAL COMMITMENT

HPWS play an important role in improving organizational performance by providing job security, a pleasant work environment, acceptable compensation, skill development, and other HR practices that all contribute to workers' positive perceptions. The more favourable their experience with your company, the more likely they are to develop a sense of trust and loyalty to the business. The first step is to assess how your current employee experience is. In this context, HPWS is commonly required in companies as a crucial role in coping with a competitive and complex environment, as well as fostering organizational commitment.

6. SIGNIFICANCE OF THE STUDY

High performance work systems is a work system and strategy presented by the SHRM that comprises a variety of HR practices that play an important role in improving the organization's performance. HPWS also establishes a favourable relationship with the organizational strategy, assisting in the enhancement of organizational performance. The study will aim to identify challenges experienced by the business while implementing HR practices and to propose solutions to those problems through the deployment of various HR practices. It will assist in the implementation of HPWS in a way that will aid in the creation of higher organizational commitment for the organization.

7. CONCLUSION AND IMPLICATION

This review of research helps to increase our understanding of HPWS. The current paper highlights how HPWS may help businesses establish organizational commitment. When developing HPWS, practitioners should keep these characteristics in mind. When examining the influence of HPWS on establishing organizational commitment, researchers should additionally consider the impact of these qualities. Existing HPWS literature has looked into the influence of HPWS on organizational commitment. There is a need for a greater understanding of HPWS's influence on departments and teams. According to the research findings, HPWS has a positive effect on organizational commitment. HPWS has been found to enhance employee skills, motivation, dedication, performance, and positive attitudes. It promotes the development of human capital, resulting in increased organizational commitment to the organization. HPWS has a positive impact on organizational performance in the long run, such as higher productivity and financial performance.

Overall, the study indicated that HPWS may help organizations achieve organizational commitment by establishing flexible capability and embedding values in employees, allowing organizations to respond to external changes and obstacles. The conclusion for General Managers and Human Resource Managers is that they should prioritize building HPWS, including teamwork, which adds to the organization's critical role in achieving organizational commitment.

ORCID ID

Shashibhushan ⬛ https://orcid.org/0009-0004-5558-8494

Dr. Rajkumar Singh ⬛ https://orcid.org/0000-0002-4962-5250

8. REFERENCES

A. U., & Olaverri, C. G. (2006). High-performance work systems and firms' operational performance: the moderating role of technology. The International Journal of Human Resource Management, 17(1), 70-85.

Afonso, D. D., Domínguez, L. R., & Núñezb, C. B. (2023). It's worth it! High performance work systems for employee job satisfaction: The mediational role of burnout. International Journal of Hospitality Management, 108, 1-13.

Afonso, D. D., Rosa, M. G., Rodríguez, F. J., & Domínguez, L. R. (2021). Effects of HighPerformance Work Systems (HPWS) on Hospitality Employees' Outcomes through Their Organizational Commitment, Motivation, and Job Satisfaction. Sustainability, 13(6), 3226.

Alafeshat, R., & Tanova, C. (2019). Servant Leadership Style and High-Performance Work System Practices: Pathway to a Sustainable Jordanian Airline Industry. Sustainability, 11, 1-21.

Al-Ajlouni, M. I. (2021). Can high-performance work systems (HPWS) promote organisational innovation? Employee perspective-taking, engagement and creativity in a moderated mediation model. Employee Relations, 43(2), 373-397.

Alnoaimi, M., & Almahamid, S. (2020). The Missing link between High Performance Work System and product Innovation: a Systematic Review. Arab Gulf Journal of Scientific Research, 37(2), 1-10.

Appelbaum, E., & Batt, R. (1993). High-Performance Work Systems: American Models of Workplace Transformation. Washington DC: Economic Policy Institution.

Appelbaum, E., Gittell, J. H., & Leana, C. (2011). High-Performance Work Practices and Sustainable Economic Growth. Washington, DC : The Center for Economic and Policy Research. Arefin, M. S.,

Arthur, J.B. (1992). The link between business strategy and industrial relations systems in American Steel mini mills. Industrial and Labour Relations Review.

Bae, Johngseok and John Lawler, J. (2000). Organizational and HRM Strategies in Korea: Impact on Firm Performance in an Emerging Economy, 502–517.

Bailey, T. (1993). Discretionary effort and the organization of work: Employee participation and work reform since Hawthorns. Working Paper, Columbia University.

Bakotic, D., and Babic, T. (2013). Relationship between Working Conditions and Job Satisfaction: The Case of Croatian Shipbuilding Company. International Journal of Business and Social Science, 4(2), 206-213.

Barney, J. (1986). Organizational culture: can it be a source of sustained competitive advantage? Academy of Management Review, 11, 656-65.

Barney, J. (1991). Firm resources and sustained competitive advantage. Journal of Management.

Becker, B.E. and Gerhart, B. (1996). The impact of human resource management on organizational performance: Progress and prospects. Academy of Management Journal, 39, 779–801.

Becker, B.E. and Huselid, M.A. (1996). Managerial compensation systems and firm performance. Paper presented at the 1996 Academy of Management meetings.

Becker, B.E. and Huselid, M.A. (1998). High performance work systems and firm performance: A synthesis of research and managerial implications. Research in Personnel and Human Resources Journal, 16, (1), 53–101.

Becker, B.E. and Huselid, M.A. (1998). High performance work systems and firm performance: A synthesis of research and managerial implications. Research in Personnel and Human Resources Journal, 16, (1), 53–101.

Becker, Brian and Huselid, Mark (1998). "High Performance Work Systems and Firm Performance: A Synthesis of Research and Managerial Implications".

Becker, Brian E. and Huselid, Mark A., High performance work systems and firm performance: A synthesis of research and managerial implications, 54–57.

Bharadwaj, S. G., Varadarajan, P. J., & Fahy, J. (1993). Sustainable Competitive Advantage in Service Industries: A Conceptual Model and Research Propositions. Journal of Marketing, 57(October), 83-99. http://dx.doi.org/10.2307/1252221

Boxall, P. and Purcell, J., Strategy and Human Resource Management. Basingstoke, Palgrave Macmillan, 2003.

Chaharbaghi, K., & Lynch, R. (1999). Sustainable competitive advantage: towards a dynamic resource-based strategy. Management Decision, 37(1), 45-50. http://dx.doi.org/10.1108/00251749910252012

Chillakuri, B., & Vanka, S. (2020). Examining the effects of workplace well-being and highperformance work systems on health harm: a Sustainable HRM perspective. Society and Business Review, 16(1), 1746-5680.

Coldwell, C., & Floyd, L. (2014). High Performance Work Systems: Building Commitment to Increase Profitability. Graziadio Business Review, 17(3), 1-11.

Collins, C. and Clark, K. (2003), "Strategic human resource practices, top management the role team social networks, and firm performance of human resource practices in creating competitive advantage organizational", 1–2.

D. Datta, J. Guthrie, and P. Wright, "Human resource management and labor productivity: Does industry matter?," Academy of Management Journal, vol. 48, no. 1, pp. 135–145, 2005.

Delaney, J.T. and Huselid, M.A. (1996). The impact of human resource management practices on performance in for-profit and nonprofit organizations. Academy of Management Journal, 949–969.

Delery, John E. and Shaw, Jason D. (2001), "The strategic management of people in work organizations: Review, synthesis, and extension", Vol. Iss: 20, pp. 165–197.

Denison, D. (1984). Corporate culture and organizational culture and effectiveness. Organization Science, 6(2), 204-23. http://dx.doi.org/10.1287/orsc.6.2.204

Dyer, L. (1993). Human resources as a source of competitive advantage. Kingston, Ont: Queen's University, Industrial Relations Centre Press.

Ehnert, I. (2006). Sustainability issues in human in human resource management: Linkages, theoretical approaches, and outlines for an emerging field.

Epstein J, Marie-Josée R (2001) Sustainability in action:identifying and measuring the key performance drivers. Long Range Plan 34:585–604. doi:10.1016/S0024-6301(01)00084-X

Esterhuyse P (2008) The sustainability balanced scorecard: its theory and applications to companies operating within the South African fishing industry. Thesis, faculty of economic and management sciences, University of Stellenbosch.

Fahy, J. (2000). The resource-based view of the firm: some stumbling blocks on the road to understanding sustainable competitive advantage. Journal of European Industrial Training, 24(2), 94-104. http://dx.doi.org/10.1108/03090590010321061

Gangai, K. N., and Agrawal, R. (2015). Job Satisfaction and Organizational Commitment: Is It important for Employee Performance. International journal of management and business research, 5(4), 269- 278

Grant, R. M. (1995). A Knowledge-Based Theory of Inter-Firm Collaboration. Academy of Management - Best Paper Proceedings, 38, 17-21. http://dx.doi.org/10.5465/AMBPP.1995.17536229

Guest, D., Michie, J., Conway, N. and Sheehan, M. 'Human resource management and performance', British Journal of Industrial Relations, Vol. 41, No. 2, 2003, pp. 291–314.

Halis, M., and Gökgöz, G. (2007). Creating organizational commitment by satisfying internal customers, Serbian Journal of Management, 2(1), 5-19.

Hong L. C., Abd Hamid N.I.N., and Salleh, N. M. (2013). A Study on the Factors Affecting Job Satisfaction amongst Employees of a Factory in Seremban, Malaysia. Business Management Dynamics, 3(1), 6-40

Huang, Ahlstrom, Lee, Chen and Hsieh. (2016), "High-performance work systems and employee engagement: empirical evidence from China", Asia Pacific Journal of Human Resources, Vol. 56 No. 3, pp. 341–359.

Hubbard G (2009) Measuring organizational performance: beyond the triple bottom line. Bus Strategy Environ 19:177–191. doi:0.1002/bse

Huselid, M. A. (1995). The Impact of Human Resource Management Practices on Turnover, Productivity, and Corporate Financial Performance. Academy of Management Journal, 38(3), 635–872.

Huselid, M. A., & Becker, B. E. (1995). The Strategic Impact of High Performance Work Systems. Imran, R., Shabbir, M. S., & Mahmood, A. (2020). High Performance Work System: An Important Link Between Transformational Leadership and Job Performance. Polish Journal of Management Studies, 22(1), 217-230.

Huselid, M.A. (1995). The impact of human resource management practices on turnover, productivity, and corporate financial performance, Academy of Management Journal, 635–672.

Huselid, M.A. (1995). The impact of human resource management practices on turnover, productivity, and corporate financial performance. Academy of Management Journal.

Huselid, M.A. (1995). The impact of human resource management practices on turnover, productivity, and corporate financial performance. Academy of Management Journal, 2–8.

Huselid, M.A. and Becker, B.E. (1996). Methodological issues in cross-sectional and panel estimates of the HR-firm performance link. Industrial Relations, 400–422. Electronic copy available at: https://ssrn.com/abstract=3419321 Human Resource Management Practices Creating High Performance 363

J. B. Barney and P. M. and Wright, "On becoming a strategic partner: the role ofhuman resources in gaining competitive advantage," Human Resource Manage-ment, vol. 37, no. 1, pp. 31–46, 1998.

J. Combs, Y. Liu, A. an. K. Hall, and D., "How much do high-performance work practices matter? A meta-analysis of their effects on organizational performance," Personnel Psychology, vol. 59, pp. 501–28, 2006.

J. G. (2013). High-Performance Work Systems and Job Control: Consequences for Anxiety Role Overload, and Turnover Intentions. Journal of Management, 39(6), 1699-1724.

J. Tracey, "A review of human resources management research: the past 10 years and implications for moving forward", International," Journal of Contemporary Hospitality Management, vol. 26, no. 5, pp. 679–705, 2014

Jackson, S.E., Schuler, R.S. and Rivero, J.C. (1989). Organizational characteristics as predictors of personnel practices. Personnel Psychology, 727–786.

Jain, A. (2010). Business Excellence Through Integration of TQM and HRM. International Journal of Enterprise and Innovation Management Studies, 3(1), 1-9. Jensen, J. M., Patel, P. C., & Messersmith,

Jeong, D. Y., & Choi, M. (2016). The impact of high-performance work systems on firm performance: The moderating effects of the human resource function's influence. Journal of Management & Organization, 22(3), 328 - 348.

Jewell, D. O., Jewell, F. S., & Kaufman, B. E. (2022). Designing and implementing highperformance work systems: Insights from consulting practice for academic researchers. Human Resource Management Review, 32(1), 1-16.

Jiang, K., Lepak, D. P., Hu, J., & Baer, J. C. (2012). How Does Human Resource Management Influence Organizational Outcomes? A Meta-Analytic Investigation of Mediating Mechanisms. Academy of Management Journal, 55(6), 1264–1294.

K. Cafferkey and T. Dundon, "Explaining the black box: HPWS and organizational climate," Personal Review, vol. 44, pp. 666–668, 2015.

K. Macky and G. and Johnson, Managing Human Resources in New Zealand Auck-land: McGraw-Hill, 2nd ed. 2003

Kaushik, D., & Mukherjee, U. (2022). High-performance work system: a systematic review of literature. International Journal of Organizational Analysis, 30(6), 1624-1643. Kintana, M. L., Alonso,

Khanifar, H., Hajlou, M. H., Abdolhosseini, B., Ataei, F., and Soltani, H. (2012). Factors Affecting the Organizational Commitment of Employees and Customer Satisfaction. Journal of Basic and Applied Scientific Research, 2(11), 11180-11185.

Kling, J. (1995, May). High performonce work systems and firm performance. Monthly Labor Review, 29-36.

Kotter, J. P., & Heskett, J. L. (1992). Corporate Culture & Performance. New York, NY: Free Press.

Kroon, B., Voorde, K., & Veldhove, M. V. (2009). Cross-level effects of high-performance work practices on burnout: Two counteracting mediating mechanisms compared. Personnel Review, 38(5), 509-525.

Lapiņa, I., Maurāne, G., & Stariņeca, O. (2013). Holistic Human Resource Management Model towards Sustainable and Sophisticated Business. Proceedings of the 17th World MultiConference on Systemics, Cybernetics and Informatics, 2, 31-36.

Lee, G., Lee, M., & Sohn, Y. (2017). High-Performance Work Systems and Firm Performance: Moderating Effects of Organizational Communication. The Journal of Applied Business Research, 33(5), 951-962.

Levine, D.I. (1995). Reinventing the workplace: How business and employees can both win. Washington, DC: Brookings Institution.

Lloyd, R., & Aho, W. (2021). The History of Human Resources in the United States: A Primer on Modern Practice. Management Open Educational Resources.

Macduffie, J. P. (1995). Human Resource Bundles and Manufacturing Performance: Organizational Logic and Flexible Production Systems in The World Auto Industry. Industrial and Labor Relations Review, 48(2), 197-221.

MacMillan, Ian C. and Schuler, Randall S. (1998), Gaining a competitive edge through human resource.

Montgomery, C. A., & Porter, M. E. (2009). Strategy: Seeking and Securing Competitive Advantage. The Harvard Business Review, Boston, M. A.

Neog, B. B., and Barua, M. (2014). Factors Influencing Employee's Job Satisfaction: An Empirical Study among Employees of Automobile Service Workshops in Assam. The SIJ Transactions on Industrial, Financial & Business Management, 2(7), 305-316.

Pak, J., & Kim, S. (2016). Team managers' implementation, high performance work systems intensity and performance: A multilevel investigation. Journal of Management, 0149206316646829

Parvin, M. M., and Kabir, M.M.N. (2011). Factors affecting employee job satisfaction of pharmaceutical sector. Australian Journal of Business and Management Research, 1(9), 113-123

Pfeffer (1994). Competitive advantage through people: Unleashing the power of the workforce. Boston: Harvard University Press.

Pfeffer, J. (1998). The Human Equation: Building profits by putting people first. Boston, Harvard Business School Press. 1998.

Raquib, M., & Arif, I. (2015). The relationships between high-performance work systems and proactive behaviors: The mediating role of perceived organizational support. European Scientific Journal,, 11(2), 312–325.

Robert Stevens (2003), High Performance Workplaces, UKWON Journal – Issue 1–2003.

Rundle, S.J. (1997), "Flexibility, adaptiveness and responsiveness (FAR-ness) as the key success factors in market entry in the south east Asian growth wedge", PhD thesis, Department of Management, Monash University, Victoria.

Salunke, G. (2015). Work environment and its effect on job satisfaction in cooperative sugar factories in Maharashtra, India. Abhinav. International Monthly Refereed Journal of Research in Management & Technology, 4(5), 21-31.

Schuler, R.S. and Jackson, S.E. (1989). Determinants of human resource management priorities and implications for industrial relations. Journal of Management, 727–786.

Schuler, R.S. and MacMillan, L.C. (1984). Gaining competitive advantage through human resource practices. Human Resource Management, 241–255.

Singh, S. P., and Rana, S. (2013). The Impact of Performance Appraisal on Organizational Commitment of Bank Employees. International Journal of Science and Research, 4(4), 2964-2967.

T. Baum, Human resources in tourism: still waiting for change? A 2015 reprise. Tourism Management, Vol.50,pp.204-212, 2015.

Wright, McMahan and McWilliams (1994), Human Resources and Sustained Competitive Advantage: A Resource-based Perspective, International Journal of Human Resource Management, 301–326.