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Group HPWS Definition
High Performance Work Systems, Corporate Social Performance and Employee Outcomes: Exploring the Missing Links

Presenter: Junsan Chang
Key Terms

→ Corporate Social Performance
→ HPWS Satisfaction
Method

Survey of 1,500 employees from companies in Jiangsu, Guizhou, and Guangxi, China.

★ 12-items questionnaires

➢ 784 Completed
  ■ 700 Usable
    ● 69% Male
    ● 31% Female
Sample questions

➢ HPWS
   ○ “Employees have clear career paths within the company”

➢ AC
   ○ “I feel part of the family in my company”

➢ OCB
   ○ “I make innovative suggestions to improve the firm”
Results

Fig. 3 The results for the hypothesized full mediation model. Note
Standardized parameter estimates. \( N = 700 \). ***(\( p < .001 \)) (two
tailed). This is a simplified version of the actual model. It does not
show indicators, error terms and exogenous factor variances
Take Home Message

➔ Be more flexible ("win-win")
➔ Go beyond financial performances (CSR)
Impact of High-Performance Work Systems on Individual and Branch Level Performance: Test of a Multilevel Model of Intermediate Linkages

Presenter: Avona Pinkston
OVERVIEW

Do HPWS impact performance on an individual and organizational level?

Are there benefits?
KEY TERMS

- Experienced HPWS
- Empowerment Climate
- Psychological Empowerment
- Service Orientation
- Service Performance
DESIGN & PROCESS

● Self-Reported Survey
  ○ 37 branches of 2 banking institutions in Ghana
  ■ 258 Respondents (involvement from: HR Director, Junior & Senior Customer Contact and Branch Managers)
PROCESS

● Response Options
  ○ Scale from 1 (Strongly Disagree) to 5 (Strongly Agree)
  ○ Scale from 1 (Highly Unsatisfactory) to 5 (Highly Satisfactory)**

● Control Variables
  ○ Age, Sex, Branch Size, and Branch Type
SURVEY-SAMPLE QUESTIONS

Use of HPWS
“The formal orientation programs of new customer contact employees are helpful for them to perform their job.”

Experienced HPWS
“Employees in my job category normally go through training programs every few years to improve our customer service skills.”

Empowerment Climate
“I receive the information needed to help me understand the performance of our branch.”
SURVEY-SAMPLE QUESTIONS

Physiological Empowerment
“I have significant autonomy in determining how I do my job.”

Service Orientation
“The best job I can imagine would involve assisting others in solving their problems.”

Service Performance**
“Readiness to respond to customers’ requests.”
RESULTS
TAKE-HOME MESSAGE

● Selection: Identify and assess candidates for service orientation qualities (e.x. Myers-Briggs)

● Self-Managed Teams

● Performance-based Rewards
The role of Employee HR Attributions in the relationship between HPWS and Employee Outcomes

Karina Van De Voorde and Susan Beijer


Presenter: Samantha Lee
Key Terms

- HR Attributions
  - Well-being Attributions
  - Performance Attributions
- Job Strain
Research Hypotheses - Model

High Performance Work System

Well-Being Attribution

Performance Attribution

Job Strain

H1

H2

H4

H6
Overview

- Exploring the link between HPWS:
  - Well-being Attributions
  - Performance Attributions
  - Job Strain

- Directly related or with mediators?
Design & Process

- Collected data from employees directly
  - 1,065 employees working in 150 units
  - Netherlands
  - Profit & non-profit sectors
  - 150 units in 73 different organizations
Survey - Example Question

● **Job Strain**
  ○ “I find it difficult to relax at the end of a working day.”

● **Four-point scale:**
  ○ 1 - Never
  ○ 2 - Sometimes
  ○ 3 - Often
  ○ 4 - Always
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Research Hypotheses - Model

High Performance Work System

Well-Being Attribution

Performance Attribution

Job Strain

0.30***

0.25*

-0.13***

0.05*
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Take-Home Message

- Organizational Culture
- Selection and Hiring
- Performance Evaluation
A Meta-Analysis of Country Differences in the High-Performance Work System–Business Performance Relationship: The Roles of National Culture and Managerial Discretion

Presenter: Deric Li
Overview

- Do HPWS work in other countries/businesses with different cultures?
- Hofstede’s Research:
  - 6 Dimensions:
    - Power Distance
    - Individualism vs Collectivism
Key Terms

- Cultural Tightness - Looseness
- Power Distance
- Performance Orientation
- Collectivism
- Institutional Flexibility
Method

• **HPWS - Business Performance Relationship**
  ○ Financial and/or Operational Performance

• **Criteria:**
  ○ 3 Industries:
    ■ Manufacturing
    ■ Service
    ■ Mixed
  ○ Measure and report use of an HPWS, not HPWP
Measures

- National Culture:
  - Power Distance
  - Performance Orientation
  - Collectivism
Measures

- Manager Discretion:
  - Cultural Tightness - Looseness
  - Institutional Flexibility
    - Flexibility of wages
    - Flexibility of hiring
    - Laws and Regulations
# Results & Findings

National Culture vs Cultural Tightness - Looseness vs HPWS - Business Performance

Table 4

*Relationship Between National Culture and Cultural Tightness–Looseness and HPWS–Business Performance Effect Sizes (r)*  
*(Variance-Known Three-Level HLM Estimates, Fisher z Transformed rs)*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Country-level characteristics</th>
<th>K</th>
<th>N_countries</th>
<th>B</th>
<th>SE</th>
<th>t</th>
<th>Study-level (Level 2) variance</th>
<th>Country-level (Level 3) variance</th>
<th>% country-level variance explained</th>
<th>% total variance explained a</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Power distance</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>0.596*</td>
<td>0.203</td>
<td>2.93</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cultural tightness–looseness b</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>0.443*</td>
<td>0.178</td>
<td>2.48</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Power distance * cultural tightness–looseness c</td>
<td>129</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>-0.084*</td>
<td>0.034</td>
<td>-2.47</td>
<td>.024</td>
<td>.006</td>
<td>64.7</td>
<td>27.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>In-group collectivism</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>0.242</td>
<td>0.149</td>
<td>1.63</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cultural tightness–looseness b</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>0.081</td>
<td>0.119</td>
<td>0.68</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>In-group collectivism * cultural tightness–looseness c</td>
<td>129</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>-0.018</td>
<td>0.022</td>
<td>-0.80</td>
<td>.023</td>
<td>.011</td>
<td>37.7</td>
<td>15.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Performance orientation</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>-0.765*</td>
<td>0.212</td>
<td>-3.62</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cultural tightness–looseness b</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>-0.439*</td>
<td>0.147</td>
<td>-2.99</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Performance orientation * cultural tightness–looseness c</td>
<td>129</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>0.105*</td>
<td>0.033</td>
<td>3.15</td>
<td>.024</td>
<td>.004</td>
<td>77.3</td>
<td>32.4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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Results & Findings
Cultural Tightness-Looseness vs Power Distance

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Low (PD)</th>
<th>High (PD)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Low (CT)</td>
<td>0.18</td>
<td>0.33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High (CT)</td>
<td>0.38</td>
<td>0.24</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Results & Findings
Cultural Tightness-Looseness vs Performance Orientation

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Low (CT)</th>
<th>High (CT)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Low (PO)</td>
<td>0.38</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High (PO)</td>
<td>0.21</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Results & Findings

Summary

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Low Cultural Tightness</th>
<th>High Cultural Tightness</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Power Distance</strong></td>
<td>High</td>
<td>Low</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Performance Orientation</strong></td>
<td>Low</td>
<td>High</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Collectivism</strong></td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Institutional Flexibility</strong></td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

- Cultural Tightness-Looseness most significant
- Institutional Flexibility has no significance
- Regardless of cultural differences and moderators, HPWS has a positive effect overall in any country.
Take-Home Message

- Can HPWS be implemented in all companies?
- Org. strategy implementation
- Competitive Advantage:
  - Consider cultural tightness:
    - Offshoring
    - Mergers & Acquisitions
Walking the Tightrope: An assessment of the relationship between high-performance work systems and organizational ambidexterity

Presenter: Monika Singh
Key Terms:

❖ Exploitation
❖ Exploration
❖ Organizational Ambidexterity
❖ Contextual Ambidexterity
  ● Discipline
  ● Stretch Goals
  ● Trust
  ● Support
Hypothesis and SEM

Overall Model Fit
\[ \chi^2 = 71.32, df = 59; CFI = .95, TLI = .95, RMSEA = .03 \]  
(90% CI: .02, .06), RMSR = .02

Dashed line indicates indirect effects. Tests of mediation (Sobel test statistic = 2.13, \( p = .03 \)); Aroian test statistic = 2.09, \( p = .04 \); Goodman test statistic = 2.17, \( p = .03 \) additionally supported the indirect effects.

* \( p < .05 \)

** \( p < .01 \)
Method

Small to Medium size high tech manufacturing companies in US
Young companies with age 10 or younger
Survey sent to CEOs of participating companies
Measures

Employee and Sales Growth (Dependent Variable)

Contextual Ambidexterity (2 dimensions Exploration and Exploitation)

HPWS (27 item survey covering 8 dimensions)
Take-Home Message

Defender and prospector strategies can coexist through organizational ambidexterity

Contextual ambidexterity is the key to SMEs’ strategic growth objective

Combine individual hr practices in the context of Discipline, Stretch Goals, Support, and Trust into an integrated HPWS
Group Take Home Message

- Align HPWS with Organizational Strategy and consider cultural differences
- Determine how to communicate to team and how they will adapt
- Look to other industries for new ideas
- Small to medium size companies can promote organizational ambidexterity through HPWS in an organizational context
WE'RE DONE
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