

DO EMPLOYEES APPROVE THE AVAILABILITY OF HIGH PERFORMANCE WORK PRACTICES IN INDIAN ORGANISATIONS?: AN EVALUATIVE STUDY

B.K. Punia*, Naval Garg**

**Professor and Dean, Haryana School of Business, and Director, Academic Staff College, Guru Jambheshwar University of Science & Technology, Hisar, India. Email: bkpunia@rediffmail.com*

***Research Scholar, Haryana School of Business, Guru Jambheshwar University of Science & Technology, Hisar, India. Email: naval_garg123@yahoo.co.in*

Abstract *High Performance Work Practices (HPWPs) has come out to limelight with growing emphasis on human aspect of the work in addition to concern for productivity or profitability, in this background employees' perception have been found to have a major impact on the success of a practice. Because HPWPs are concerned with human aspect of the work thus they are considered as a tool of value creation and value enhancement for the organisation. The present paper attempts to access the employees' perception regarding availability of the HPWPs. In all, 35 dimensions of HPWPs were identified by the researchers and the perception was assessed on five point scale. Here employees' perception comes out to be in 'Fairly Effective' category of five-point rating scale. The categorization of HPWPs has been done by applying factor analysis and the variations in employees' perception have been studied by applying t-test. Factorial design has been used to discuss interaction effect of more than two variables like that of gender, sector, nature of organisation etc.*

Keywords: *High Performance, High Performance Work Practices, High Performance Organisation, Gender, Serving Sector.*

INTRODUCTION

Optimization of performance both in qualitatively and quantitatively terms has become a prime motive for all types of the organisations around the world and India is no exception. Here too every organisation whether it is a public organisation or a private one, tries to maximize its performance irrespective of size, resources, time, and place. Moreover in the times where every firm is too obsessed with performance, performance not only includes productivity or profitability of the employees but it also circumscribes human element of work too i.e. employee perception, attitude, motivation level etc. These elements have become a means to improve performance. But today High Performance Work Practices supporters consider them as end result too. Moreover it is becoming progressively clear that employees' perception and attitude level for HPWPs plays an important role in institutionalisation a high performance culture in the organisation. Initially proponent of classical theorists started scientific management theory and principle of management to enhance performance of the employees. But now emphasis is on Neo-human relation school, which considers man as a rational and responsible being. The theorists regard that

an employee loves to takes responsibility and will work to maximize efficiency as it satisfies individual's need of self development and social belongingness. Thus an organisation looks for certain innovative & unconventional practices to achieve desired goal. In this background, High Performance Works Practices has come to limelight.

DEFINING HIGH PERFORMANCE WORK PRACTICES

Baker (1999) found that researches have not been able to define HPWPs precisely and a number of distinct concepts and views about HPWPs are found in extensive literature review. These bundles of high performance practices had been called with different names as 'high performance work systems', 'alternate work practices' and 'flexible work practices' (Delaney & Godard, 2001). Moreover High Performance Work Practices have been known as a collection of activities that have a positive implication for performance enhancement and performance management of the employees. Further Godard (2004) found that these practices bring greater performance than traditional practices so they are most commonly promoted as 'best practices' for

employees and employment related practices. In USA, the term “High Performance Work Practices” has been utilized to internalize workplace innovation and experiments by management. In the sense, the performance practices can help an organisation to align more closely with contemporary activities and help an organisation to leave out its traditional and unproductive practices (Osterman, 1994).

Although HPWPs are known with various names, even then they share common features. As Becker (1997) highlighted that common characteristics like employee involvement, rationalize work procedures, incentives based upon performance and tailor made training programs etc. attached with HPWPs paradigm and these practices have found to have perfect alignment with the needs of the employees. HPWPs require a high input in terms of money and human resource and high output in terms of enhanced skills, value, knowledge, motivation level, morale, commitment, and flexibility of the employees are expected out of it. Moreover, a proponent of high performance work practices supports greater participation in workplace decisions (Van Buren and Werner, 1996). It makes employee involvement and empowerment as an essential feature of the HPWPs. But there does not exist any unity among researchers on practices included under High Performance Work Practices paradigm, different researchers includes different set of practices in the high performance paradigm (Becker and Gerhart, 1996). It makes it difficult to segregate various practices under different sub heads of performance. Same has been supported Godard (1998), he concluded that, there exists considerable variations in how HPWPs are practiced in reality. Paul Osterman (1999) segregated these practice in four categories: job rotation, quality circle, total quality management, and team working. In the background various component of HPWPs have been discussed as follows.

Components of High Performance Work Practices

A number of researchers have discussed numerous distinct components of high performance work system. Some emphasized on one dimensions of performance while other scholars highlighted some other aspect of performance. Godard (2004) collaborated a number of perspectives into few major components of performance system. A brief discussion of these components is as follows.

- A vision based of escalating customer value by an approach of differentiating an organisation's products or services and gradually moving towards the customization of its offering to the needs of individual customers. It highlights the customer and market demand sensitive aspect of an organisation.
- Leadership from the top and throughout the organisation to create momentum. A visionary and

long sighted leader at the top is always beneficial. But at the same time an organisation must build up true leaders at every level of hierarchy.

- Decentralized, devolved decision making by those closest to the customer. It will help in constantly renew and improve the offer to customers. And the same time it is employee friendly too as it facilitates in development of people capabilities at all levels with emphasis on self-management, team capabilities and project-based activity.
- Support systems and culture which include performance operations and people management processes, aligned to organisational objectives to build trust, enthusiasm and commitment to the direction taken by the organisation.
- Fair treatment for those who leave the organisation and engagement with the needs of the community outside the organisation. It is an important component of trust and commitment-based relationships both within and outside the organisation. It highlights the significance of having cordial relations with all stakeholders of the firm.
- Employees must be willing to learn new skills, offer ideas and suggestions based on their knowledge and commit to quality and productivity. This requires employee's trust and cooperation which may be difficult to achieve and maintain
- Institutional mechanism to support and promote team building. A team should not only be constructed rather be bestowed with adequate resources, so that it could independently. A self-sustained and self-managed team should be the motto behind every process of team building.
- A strong organisational support system for research and development. HPWPs need dynamism and active involvement of both academicians and practitioners. Thus firms are required to implement adequate resources, time and effort to set up a conducive culture that supports change and innovation.
- Openness and two way communication revitalizes the chances of converting conflict into constructive criticism of existing setting. They will help to highlight the deficiencies in the system. Moreover an open and heartily consultation between employees of all rank helps to evolve best alternative.

OBJECTIVES AND METHODOLOGY

The prime objective of the present research has been to give an insight into availability level of High Performance Work Practices in Indian organisations. The incidental objectives of the present research were as under:

- To examine the employees' perception regarding availability of HPWPs and to discuss the significance of the availability status.
- To evaluate difference in perception regarding availability of HPWPs across genders, sectors, organisations etc.
- To execute factorial design for in-depth understanding of variations in employees' perception.
- To study the extracted factors of HPWPs and perceptual differences based on various parameters like gender, sector etc.

The present study is based upon exploratory-cum-descriptive research design and has used primary data. For data collection, a structured questionnaire consisting of 35 High Performance Work Practices has been used. In addition to it, there were eight other variables related to general information of respondents. The research paper explores the perception of employees regarding availability of 35 High Performance Work Practices which were selected depending previous studies in the same field and suitability and applicability in Indian settings. These practices were subjected to five-point rating scale and numerical value ranging from 1 to 5 was assigned. Literature review highlighted the need of five-point scale, as availability of any practice could not be accessed as available and unavailable, as there could be many levels of availability. Moreover different employees may see same level of availability from different angles and may rate their availability differently. So multiple rating scale is used in which numerical value is assigned as 1 for unavailable, 2 for partially availability, 3 for fairly availability, 4 for availability and 5 for highly availability were assigned. A sample of 350 respondents is used to address the objectives of the study and explore availability level of these practices across various demographic factors like two genders, various sectors, employees of Indian and foreign companies etc. Factor analysis has reduced these practices into nine factors. Difference in availability is adjudged for significance using student t-test. Factorial design has been used to discuss the interaction effect of more than two variables and the significance of these interactions has been adjudged with the help of ANOVA.

RESULT AND DISCUSSION

The various aspect of employees' perception regarding availability of HPWPs in Indian Organisations have been explored and the findings are presented as per Table 1 which revealed that perception of employee regarding availability of HPWPs lies at 'Fairly Available' level on five-point scale with a mean of 2.72. The perception of males employees is more favorable (mean=2.94) than that of females employees (mean=2.52) and similar sort of difference is seen across perception of employees of service sector with mean=2.87

as compared to manufacturing sector employees with a mean=2.65. Further employees of private sector (mean= 2.92) and that of public sector (mean= 2.60) also lies in 'partially available' category of five point rating scale and clearly perception of employees of private sector is more positive for availability of HPWPs in their organisations than the perception of public sector employees.

Table1: Employees' Perception Regarding Availability of HPWPs (Mean)

Parameter	Overall Mean	Parameter	Overall Mean
Male	2.94	Public	2.60
Female	2.52	Private	2.92
Indian	2.75	Manufacturing	2.65
Foreign	3.02	Service	2.87
Overall	2.76 i.e. FAIRLY AVAILABLE		

Source: Primary Data

Moreover employees of foreign organisations have most positive perception for availability of High Performance Practices (mean= 3.02) and lies in 'Available' category, while that of Indian organisations is least favorable for availability of performance practices (mean=2.75). The table definitely explained status of HPWPs among various organisations in India and highlights the dire need of institutionalizing HPWPs in Indian organisations.

Table 2 illustrates that employees' overall perception regarding availability of HPWPs lie in middle zone of five point rating scale. Only 7% and 20% of employees have been found to perceive these activities as 'highly available' and 'available' respectively. Very interestingly nearly 50% of the employees have been found to regard them as 'fairly available' and a significant percentage of 23% perceives them as 'partially available'. None of the employee is found to perceive High performance activities as 'unavailable'. Further, the table successfully depicts that there exists clear difference in perception of males and female employees as 42% of male employees regards such practices as 'fairly available' in contrast to 60% female employees. With regard to 'available' category the percentage of males is somewhat higher (24%) as compared to females (15%). The perception is also studied in manufacturing and service sector wherein employees of service sector have been found to possess more 'availability' (27%) as compared to manufacturing sector employees (13%). Further 53% of employees in service sector perceive them as fairly available and in contrast a bit lesser 47% employee of manufacturing sector does so. Luckily none of the employee from either sector or either gender has revealed that they regard these practices as 'unavailable'. Further in contrast to 36% employees of private sector only 10% employee of public sector comes under 'partially available' category. Corresponding percentage in 'fairly available' zone in public and private sector are 40%

Table 2: Employees' Perception Regarding Availability of HPWPs (Percentage)

Availability level	PERCENTAGE OF EMPLOYEES								Overall %
	Gender		Organisation		Sector		Origin		
	M	F	Mfg	Service	Pub.	Pvt.	India	Foreign	
Highly Available	09	05	08	07	04	10	02	13	07
Available	24	15	13	27	20	20	10	33	20
Fairly Available	42	60	47	53	40	60	53	47	50
Partially Available	25	20	32	13	36	10	35	07	23
Unavailable	00	00	00	00	00	00	00	00	00

Source: Primary Data

and 60% respectively. Moreover only 7% of employees in public sector and 10% employees in private sector consider HPWPs as 'highly available'. Interestingly more than half employees of foreign companies perceive high performance activities as 'fairly available' while corresponding figure for Indian organisation is only 47%. Percentage of employees in 'available' category is 10% and 33% for Indian and foreign organisations respectively. In nutshell none of the employee rates these practices as 'unavailable'. In all employees perception for availability HPWPs highlights a dire need of implementing these practices more aggressively in Indian organisations.

HYPOTHESIS TESTING

Hypothesis 1

H₀ (Null hypothesis): There is no variation in the perception regarding availability of HPWPs among male and female employees.

H₁ (Alternate Hypothesis): Employees' perception for availability of HPWPs varies significantly for male and female employees. Here two-tailed test would be used.

Hypothesis 2

H₀ (Null hypothesis): There is no variation in the perception of employees of manufacturing and service sector regarding availability of HPWPs.

H₁ (Alternate Hypothesis): Employees' perception regarding availability varies significantly across manufacturing and service sector. Here also two-tailed test would be used.

Hypothesis 3

H₀ (Null hypothesis): There is no variation in the perception among employees of Indian and foreign organisations.

H₁ (Alternate Hypothesis): Perception for availability of HPWPs among employees of Indian and foreign organisations vary significantly. Here also two-tailed test would be used.

Hypothesis 4

H₀ (Null hypothesis): There is no variation in perception regarding availability among employees of public and private organisations.

H₁ (Alternate Hypothesis): Employees' perception regarding availability of employees of High Performance Work Practices varies significantly for public and private sector. Here also two-tailed test would be used.

Table 3: Hypothesis Testing

Hypothesis	Calculated Z Value	Critical Value*	Result
Hypothesis-1	9.69	1.96	Accepted
Hypothesis-2	4.30	1.96	Accepted
Hypothesis-3	5.19	1.96	Accepted
Hypothesis-4	9.79	1.96	Accepted

*Critical Value at 95% level of significance

Table 3 depicts that if critical value i.e. Z would be adjudged at 5% level of significance. If absolute value of calculated value of Z is more than critical value of Z then null hypothesis is rejected else null hypothesis is accepted. So it comes out that perception difference among all variables like gender, sector and nature of organisations vary and varies significantly too. And in all the cases null hypothesis is rejected and alternate hypothesis is accepted which suggests significant difference in employees' perception among various parameters.

FACTORIAL DESIGN

In statistical research work, a factorial experiment is used extensively where experiment consists of two or more distinct factors or variables. And every variable is

considered to have its own discrete possible values. Here during experimentation probability of occurrence of all possible combinations of these levels across all such factors are taken into consideration of the study. Here in the present study each factor has only two levels. For example, with two factors each taking two levels, a factorial experiment would have four treatment combinations in total.

Table 4: Availability across Genders for Manufacturing and Service Organisations

Mean	Male	Female	Overall
Manufacturing Organisations	2.84	2.64	2.65
Service Organisations	3.04	2.41	2.87
Overall	2.94	2.52	2.76

Table 4 defines the perception of male and female employees regarding availability of High Performance Work Practices differently for manufacturing and service sector. It comes out that difference in perception of female employees is greater across two sectors than difference in the perception of male employees. Male employees of both manufacturing and service sector perceive HPWPs as more available than their female counterparts. Male employees of service sector (mean=3.04) considers HPWPs as more available than male employees of manufacturing sector (mean=2.84). On the contrary female employees of manufacturing sector (mean=2.64) have more perceptual mean than female employees of service sector (mean=2.41).

Table 5: Availability of HPWPs across Genders in Public and Private Sector

Mean	Male	Female	Overall
Public Sector	2.66	2.52	2.60
Private Sector	3.20	2.52	2.92
Overall	2.94	2.52	2.76

Table 5 highlights that perception of male employees differs across two sectors, while that of female employees is exactly same for both sectors with mean value as 2.52. Male employees of private sector (mean=3.20) perceives HPWPs as more available than male employees of public sector (mean=2.66). The significance of such difference in awareness level is adjudged later on using ANOVA.

Table 6: Availability across Genders for Indian and Foreign Organisations

Mean	Male	Female	Overall
Indian Company	2.82	2.31	2.75
Foreign Company	3.11	2.69	3.02
Overall	2.94	2.52	2.76

Table 6 shows that the perception of male and female employees regarding availability of High Performance Work Practices across Indian and foreign organisations. It depicts a large deviance in awareness level of male employees across two types of organisations. Male employees of foreign based firms are more aware with a mean value of 3.62 than males of India based organisations that has a mean value of 3.28. The difference in awareness level does not vary to a great extent among female employees of two types of firms.

Table 7: Availability Across Public and Private Sector for Manufacturing and Service Organisations

Mean	Manufacturing Organisations	Service Organisations	Overall
Public Sector	2.59	2.61	2.60
Private Sector	3.13	2.69	2.92
Overall	2.65	2.87	2.76

Table 7 depicts awareness level of manufacturing and service sector employees for public and private sector. Here, employees of manufacturing and service sector do not vary greatly across public and private sector. But the difference is wide across employees of public and private sector for manufacturing and service sector employees.

Table 8 illustrates the significance of various factorial design used in the research work. Here significant value of first design have a value greater than .05, thus the difference in perception is insignificant. As a result of which interaction effect of the two variables has been discarded herewith. Further factorial design of all other three variables are found to be significant. As significant value is .000 which is less than value of .005 thus interaction effect between gender and manufacturing and service sector comes out to be significant. Similar interaction effect in factorial design no-3 and factorial design no-4 is also found significant, which shows that both gender and sector have an influence over employees' perception for availability of High Performance Work Practices.

SEGMENTATION OF HPWPS

35 dimensions of HPWPs were subjected to principal components factor analysis wherein to define/ identify the factors clearly, a factor loading exceeding 0.4 was considered and included in the factor. KMO and Bartlett's Test showed a value of .719 which suggested for appropriateness of data for factor analysis. Thereafter factor analysis was administered and nine factors were extracted which are discussed as under:

F-1: Reward Oriented HPWPs which includes incentive pay, flexi timing, team reward, job rotation, job enrichment and job sharing. The factor-1 has an Eigen value of 4.752 and it defines 13.577 % of variance.

Table 8: Significance in Factorial Design

S. No	Independent Variable 1	Independent Variable 2	Sig. Value
1	Gender	Sector-Public & Private	0.812
2	Gender	Organisation-Manufacturing & Service	0.000
3	Gender	Company-Indian & Foreign	0.000
4	Sector-Public & Private	Organisations-Manufacturing & Service	0.001

Table 9: Employees' Perception Regarding Availability of Factors of HPWPs

Availability	MEAN								
	Gender		Organisation		Sector		Origin		Overall Mean
Factor	M	F	Mfg	Service	Pub	Pvt	India	Foreign	
F-1	3.16	3.44	2.70	3.01	2.81	2.97	2.83	2.90	2.86
F-2	3.40	2.47	2.87	3.13	3.02	3.03	3.03	3.10	3.00
F-3	2.55	2.35	2.32	2.32	2.37	2.54	2.44	2.50	2.47
F-4	2.69	2.40	2.27	2.86	2.57	2.78	2.56	2.56	2.56
F-5	2.93	2.45	2.52	2.93	2.88	2.92	2.93	2.44	2.72
F-6	3.01	2.97	3.02	3.06	3.05	3.16	3.03	3.06	3.04
F-7	2.78	2.75	2.66	2.88	2.80	2.85	2.73	2.82	2.77
F-8	3.01	2.87	2.78	3.13	2.88	2.97	2.90	3.03	2.95
F-9	2.61	2.45	2.46	2.63	2.61	2.67	2.57	2.51	2.54

F-2: Traditional HRM Practices which includes regular performance appraisal, competency and potential test, post retirement benefit plan, training and development, and formal recruitment & interview. The factor has an Eigen value of 3.905 and it defines 11.157 % of variance.

F-3: Value Creating HPWPs which includes human resource audit, human resource accounting, multi-skilling and yoga and meditation. The factor has an Eigen value of 3.140 and it defines 8.972 % of variance.

F-4: Employee Engagement HPWPs includes attitude survey, feedback mechanism, human resource information system, highlight best employee, counseling session, and formal grievance redressal procedure. It has an Eigen value of 2.947 and it defines 8.420 % of variance.

F-5: Team Oriented HPWPs includes problem solving team, continuous improvement team and semi-autonomous team. It has an Eigen value of 2.854 and it defines 8.155 % of variance.

F-6: Social and Safety Need driven HPWPs which includes social gathering, family insurance plan and Safe, healthy and happy workplace. The factor-6 has an Eigen value of 2.478 and it defines 7.081 % of variance.

F-7: Employee Empowerment HPWPs which includes employee stock option plan, management by objective and quality circle. The factor has an Eigen value of 2.387 and it defines 6.819 % of variance.

F-8: Procedural Improvement HPWPs which includes staff suggestion scheme and team briefing. The factor has an Eigen value of 2.303 and it defines 6.581 % of variance.

F-9: Psycho-Strengthening HPWPs which includes corporate social responsibility and surprise factor. The factor-9 has an Eigen value of 2.13 and it defines 6.088 % of variance.

An Insight Into Nine Factors of HPWPs

Nine factors extracted after factors analysis are studied differently to analyse overall, gender wise, sector wise and organisation's origin wise perception regarding availability for High Performance Work Practices. Perceptual differences based on various parameters have been discussed as below:-

Table 9 illustrates employees' perception regarding availability for nine factors. It depicts that employees' perception is most positive for availability of factor-6 i.e. social and safety need driven HPWPs. HPWPs included in the factors are social gathering, family insurance scheme and safe, healthy and happy workplace. It symbolizes the employees' concern for informal and safety aspect of work life. Employees' perception for availability of factor-2 i.e. Traditional HRM practices and factor-8 i.e. Procedural improvement HPWPs come out be very close to each other. Their respective perceptual mean is 3.00 and 2.95. Further employees perceive value creating HPWPs i.e. factor-3 as least available practice, thus organisations are required

Table 10: Gender-based Variations in Employees' Perception Regarding Availability

Factor No.	FACTORS	Male v/s Female		
		t-Value	df	Degree of Sig.
F-1	Reward Oriented HPWPs	7.650	348	.006
F-2	Traditional HRM Practices	11.590	348	.503
F-3	Value Creating HPWPs	2.793	348	.000
F-4	Employee Engagement HPWPs	3.272	348	.644
F-5	Team Oriented HPWPs	4.643	348	.002
F-6	Social and Safety Need driven HPWPs	1.237	348	.000
F-7	Employee Empowerment HPWPs	0.379	348	.000
F-8	Procedural Improvement HPWPs	1.612	348	.000
F-9	Psycho-Strengthening HPWPs	1.955	348	.000

to publicise and institutionalize practices like yoga and meditation, human resource accounting. Further employees' perception regarding availability is adjudged across various parameter like gender, sector etc. Male employees rated factor-2 i.e. Traditional HRM Practices as most available. The factor rated first with a mean value of 3.40. Whereas female employees perceive factor-1 i.e. Reward oriented HPWPs as most available. The factor includes practices like incentive pay, team reward etc. But both male and female employees consider factor-3 i.e. value creating HPWPs (male mean=2.55, female mean=2.35) as least available.. Overall mean of male employees (2.94) is greater than that of females employees (mean=2.52). Same trend is also observed here too, as for only one factor mean of female employees is greater than male employees. The factor is Reward oriented HPWPs i.e. factor-1. Female employees mean was calculated as 3.44 whereas for male employees mean comes out to be 3.40. And for rest of factors male employees' perception is more positive than perception of female employees.

Further, in contrast of employees of service sector who consider factor-3 i.e. value creating HPWPs as least available, employees of manufacturing sector perceive factor-4 i.e. employee engagement HPWPs as least available. As far as employees of manufacturing sector are concerned, they regard social and safety need driven HPWPs (mean=3.02) as most available. And employees of service sector have rated two factors as most available. In service sector five factors are rated higher than the overall mean and rest of three factors are rated lower. The factors having lower mean than 2.87 for service sector employees are value creating HPWPs, employee engagement HPWPs and psycho-strengthening HPWPs.

Further employee's perception regarding availability for nine factors of high performance paradigm is greater for private sector employees than public sector employees. It reflects

the relatively poor condition of availability level for HPWPs in public sector organisations. Moreover employees of both public and private sector have rated maximum availability of factor-6 i.e. social and safety need driven HPWPs (public sector mean=3.05, private sector mean=3.16). Similarly employees of both sector have rated Value creating HPWPs as least available practices (public sector mean=2.37, private sector mean=2.54). Similarly both sector employees have rated same factors as factor-2 and factor-6 as 'Fairly Available'

Significance of Variations in Employees' Perception Regarding Availability of HPWPs

As discussed above in all nine factors have been extracted by applying factor analysis. After exploration of the factors the variation on specific basis need to be assessed to make the study more useful. Variation in two phenomena's induced different treatment, as one solution doesn't suits every situation as there is no common key for all locks. Thus it has become imperative to analyse the variations in employees' perception regarding availability of HPWPs across their gender and their servicing sector. The variations for all the factors across gender and serving sector have been examined by applying t-test the findings are presented as follows.

Table 10 states that if significant value exceeds the .05 value then implied null hypothesis is accepted. In other cases where significant value lies below 0.05, null hypothesis is rejected and alternate hypothesis i.e. difference in the perception of male and female regarding availability level of HPWPs is significant is accepted. When t-test is applied on all nine factors, six factors showed that difference in perception regarding availability between male and female employees is significant. And for rest of three factors difference perception of male and female employees is insignificant. Factors which highlighted significant difference are value creating HPWPs, social and safety need driven HPWPs, team oriented HPWPs, procedural improvement HPWPs, and employee

Table 11: Organisation-based Variations in Employees' Perception Regarding Availability

Factor No.	FACTORS	Manufacturing v/s Service		
		t-Value	df	Degree of Sig.
F-1	Reward Oriented HPWPs	2.348	348	0.442
F-2	Traditional HRM Practices	0.606	348	0.036
F-3	Value Creating HPWPs	1.374	348	0.130
F-4	Employee Engagement HPWPs	4.962	348	0.000
F-5	Team Oriented HPWPs	3.722	348	0.294
F-6	Social and Safety Need driven HPWPs	2.288	348	0.222
F-7	Employee Empowerment HPWPs	1.979	348	0.522
F-8	Procedural Improvement HPWPs	0.468	348	0.010
F-9	Psycho-Strengthening HPWPs	3.258	348	0.120

empowerment HPWPs and psycho-strengthening HPWPs. In all these six High Performance factors male employees have more positive perception regarding availability than their female counterparts, as mean of perception for availability of male employees is higher than female employees for all six factors. It clearly reflects the need to work upon perception of female employees for High Performance Work Practices that constitute these six factors.

Table 11 highlights that for three factors the difference in the perception of manufacturing and service sector employees regarding availability of HPWPs is significant. And for rest of six factors difference in perception of employees is insignificant. Factors for which significant value is less than .05 are, employee engagement practices, traditional HRM practices and procedural improvement related HPWPs. As a result of which alternate hypothesis is accepted, which suggest that difference in perception of employees of manufacturing and service sector for these three factors is significant. In all these three factors service sector employees have more positive perception than employees of manufacturing sector employees, as mean of employees perception for service sector is higher than that of manufacturing sector employees. It clearly reflects the need of specific requirement of availability enhancement program in both manufacturing and service sector.

Table 12 highlights that when t-test is applied on all nine factors, for as many as six factors the difference in the perception of employees of Indian and Foreign organisations is significant. The factors are reward oriented HPWPs, team oriented HPWPs, traditional HRM Practices, procedural improvement HPWPs, social and safety need driven HPWPs, and employee engagement HPWPs. Out of these six factors, for three factors i.e. factor-1, factor-2 and factor-8 perception of employees of foreign organisations is more positive than that of employees of Indian organisations. And for factor-4 although overall mean for both types of organisations is same, but t-test reveals that difference in perception for this factor is significant. For factor-5 and

factor-6 perception of employees of Indian organisation is more positive than employees of foreign organisation, as overall mean for these factors has higher value for Indian organisations. It clearly reflects the need of specific deficit of HPWPs in both Indian and foreign organisations. Rest of the three factors that includes value creating HPWPs, employee empowerment HPWPs and psycho-strengthening HPWPs, although showed difference in the perception but clearly this difference is not significant. And consequently perception of employees of both sorts of organisations is considered almost same for these three factors.

Table 13 showed the significance of difference in the perception of the employees of public and private sector regarding availability of nine factors extracted from factor analysis. When t-test is applied on all nine factors, four factors showed that the difference in the perception of the employees of public and private sector employees is significant. And for rest of five factors difference in perception across two sectors is insignificant. Factors for which significant values are less than .05 are traditional HRM Practices, team oriented HPWPs, employee empowerment HPWPs, social and safety need driven HPWPs. As a result of which alternate hypothesis is accepted, which suggest that difference in perception for these four factors is significant. In these all four factors private sector employees' perception is more positive than employees of private sector. It highlights the need of availability enhancement program for public sector employees. Another five factors that includes, reward oriented HPWPs, value creating HPWPs, employee engagement practices, psycho-strengthening HPWPs and procedural improvement HPWPs although showed difference in perception but clearly this difference is not significant. And consequently perception of employees across two sectors for these five factors is considered almost same.

CONCLUSION

Table 12: Company' Origin Status Variations in Perception Regarding Availability

Factor No.	FACTORS	Indian v/s Foreign		
		t-Value	df	Degree of Sig.
F-1	Reward Oriented HPWPs	0.740	348	0.000
F-2	Traditional HRM Practices	0.625	348	0.001
F-3	Value Creating HPWPs	0.654	348	0.406
F-4	Employee Engagement HPWPs	0.022	348	0.007
F-5	Team Oriented HPWPs	4.122	348	0.003
F-6	Social and Safety Need driven HPWPs	0.386	348	0.008
F-7	Employee Empowerment HPWPs	1.043	348	0.934
F-8	Procedural Improvement HPWPs	1.551	348	0.000
F-9	Psycho-Strengthening HPWPs	0.759	348	0.119

Table 13: Sector Based Variations in Employees' Perception Regarding Availability

Factor No.	FACTORS	Public v/s Private		
		t-Value	Df	Degree of Sig.
F-1	Reward Oriented HPWPs	3.191	348	0.666
F-2	Traditional HRM Practices	2.890	348	0.000
F-3	Value Creating HPWPs	3.283	348	0.120
F-4	Employee Engagement HPWPs	7.048	348	0.060
F-5	Team Oriented HPWPs	3.980	348	0.000
F-6	Social and Safety Need driven HPWPs	0.401	348	0.003
F-7	Employee Empowerment HPWPs	2.650	348	0.000
F-8	Procedural Improvement HPWPs	4.210	348	0.712
F-9	Psycho-Strengthening HPWPs	2.173	348	0.099

In the era of relentless and throat cut competition, HPWPs have established themselves as distinct and important paradigm of performance excellence. High performance organisation looks for certain innovative and unconventional practices to achieve desired goal. In this background the present paper has successfully highlighted the importance of employees' perception regarding availability for effective implementation of HPWPs. It was found that employees' perception for HPWPs rests at "Fairly Available" on five-point scale and it signifies the dire scarcity of high performance practices in Indian settings. Paper supports the need of implementing performance practices in organisations. Paper has astutely discussed employees' perception regarding availability of HPWPs among male, female employees, and also of employees of manufacturing and service sector etc. More positive perception of males in comparison to females suggests that organisations seeking to implement HPWPs needs to make HPWPs popularize among females so that these practices could benefit both males and females equally. Further it is desirable for organisations also as both male and female acts as two inseparable wheels of a vehicle and any imbalance may

cause problem in implementation. The categorization of HPWPs brought broader dimensions of HPWPs into light and a total of 35 HPWPs were reduced in nine factors. This segregation will enlighten further researchers to concretize there research work as future researchers can use broader dimensions extracted here instead of dealing with a large number of dimensions with HPWPs. Factorial design has highlighted the interaction effect of various parameters of the study. The application of t-test showed significant variations in employees' perception regarding availability of High Performance Work Practices across various parameters like gender, sector, organisations etc. Further hypothesis found significant difference in employees' perception across male and female employees, across employees of manufacturing and service sector, across employees of public and private sector organisations and across employees of Indian and foreign firms. All this discussion would help an HPWPs practitioner to take care of all significant differences in perception during implementation process.

REFERENCES

- Abraham, J.Y., & Knight, D. J. (2001). Strategies innovation: Leveraging creative action for more profitable growth. *Strategy and Leadership*, 29(1), 21-27.
- Baird, C.L., & Reynold, J. R. (2004). Employee awareness of family leave benefit: The effects of family, work, and gender. *The Sociological Quarterly*, 45(2), 325-353.
- Baker, K., Olson, J., & Morisseau, D. (1994). Work practices, fatigue and nuclear power plant safety performance. *Human Factors*, 36(2), 244-257.
- Becker, B., & Gerhart, B. (1996) The impact of human resource management on performance: Progress and prospects. *Academy of Management Journal*, 38(4), 779-801.
- Boxall, P., & Macky, K. (2009). Research and theory on high-performance work systems: progressing the high-involvement stream. *Human Resource Management Journal*, 19(1), 3-23.
- Brown, C., & Reich, M. (1997). Micro-macro linkages in high performance employment systems. *Organizational Studies*, 18(5), 765-781.
- Combs, J., Liu, Y., Hall, A., & Ketchen, D. (2006). How much do high performance work practices matter? A meta-analysis of their effects on organizational performance. *Personnel Psychology*, 59(3), 501-528.
- David, R., (1998) Exploding the myth of high performance teams. *Team Performance Management*, 4(7), 306-311.
- Delaney, J. T., & Godard, J. (2001). An industrial relations perspective on the high performance paradigm. *Human Resource Management Review*, 11(4), 395-429.
- Edwards, P., & Wright, M. (2000). High involvement work systems and performance outcomes. *The International Journal of Human Resource Management*, 12(4), 568-585.
- Godard, J., (1999). Do implementation processes and rationales matter? The case of workplace reforms. *Journal of Management Studies*, 36(5), 679-704.
- Godard, J., (2004). Critical assessment of high performance paradigm. *British Journal of Industrial Relation*, 42(2), 349-378.
- Guest, D. (2002). Human resource management, corporate performance and employee well-being: Building the worker into HRM. *The Journal of Industrial Relations*, 44(3), 335-358.
- Hirsh, E., & Kmec, J. A. (2009). HR structures: Reducing discrimination or raising right awareness. *Industrial Relation: A Journal of Economy and Society*, 48(3), 512-523.
- Macky, K., & Boxall, P. (2007). Research and theory on high-performance work systems: progressing the high-involvement stream. *Human Resource Management Journal*, 19(1), 3-23.
- McCartney, J., & Teague, P. (2004). The diffusion of high performance employment practices in republic of Ireland. *International Journal of Manpower*, 25(7), 598-617.
- Osterman, P. (1994). How common is workplace transformation and who adopts it. *Industrial and Labor Relations Review*, 47(2), 173-188.
- Squires, P. (2002). *Developing Skill Standards Built Upon High Performance Work Organization Practices*. Retrieved from http://www.appliedskills.com/White%20Papers/HPWG_paper_2.pdf
- Thompson, P. (2001). Systems of production: Markets, organizations and performance. *Employee Relation*, 25(3), 627-629.
- Van Buren, M. E., & Werner, J. M. (1996). High performance work systems. *Business and Economic Review*, 43(1), 15-35.
- Wood, S. (1999). Human resource management and performance. *International Journal for Management Review*, 1(4), 367-413.
- Youndt, M. A., Snell, S. A., Dean, J.W. & Lepak, D. P. (1996). Human resource management, manufacturing strategy, and firm performance. *Academy of Management Journal*, 39(4) 836-866.