

High Performance Work Practices: A Study of Variations Based on Personal Characteristics

–B. K. Punia*, Naval Garg**

ABSTRACT

High Performance Work Practices (HPWPs) has evolved as a pivotal paradigm of performance excellence. These practices are applied in bundles to accrue complementary benefits associated with each practices. Literature suggests that success of any system relies on various employee related factors. The present paper highlights variations among employees' awareness and perception for HPWPs based on individual characteristics like gender, sex, experience etc. Differences in employees' awareness and perception could arise owing to different inbuilt mechanism to filter external information. Presently as many as thirty-five HPWPs have been considered. Factor analysis reduces 35 practices into nine factors. It is observed that employees' awareness varies significantly across age, experience and educational qualification of the employees. However employees' awareness is observed to gender neutral. Further employees' perception is reported to vary significantly across all four individual characteristic taken in the study i.e. gender, age, experience and educational qualification of the employees. Further nine extracted factors are subjected to test of variance across various variables of individual differences. Lastly paper gives a glimpse of practical utility of the findings and a brief description of future research scope is also given herewith.

Keywords: *High Performance Work Practices, High Performance Work System, Gender, Awareness, Perception*

INTRODUCTION

Maximization of profit is the ultimate aim for modern day's corporate world. Every organisation tries to surpass previous year profit margin

through sustained and continuous efforts. Here optimum utilization of resources takes centre stage with an emphasis on maximizing benefits from all of its resources including employees. Performance of human resource is considered as important as performance of any other means of production like land or capital. Modern researcher believes that performance does not accelerate at its own rather it gains impetus through proper planning and management. Thus firms have started to institutionalize various types of performance management system. These performance management systems synchronize with other systems of organisation and stimulate employees to perform better. The approach towards performance maximization has changed tremendously over a period of time. Classical theorists propagated scientific management theory and principal of management in their desire to improve efficiency and effectiveness of the employees. But with the passage of time, now emphasis is on Neo-human relation and Neo-behaviourists school. The school regards employee as a rational, responsible and as a lover of complex and innovative work. It advocates delegation of authority and responsibility, employee empowerment and participation, two way communications. This new approach has given birth to adaption of High Performance Work Practices at work place. HPWPs are bundle of high performance practices that are applied in tandem to accrue complementary benefits of each practice. Thus Twenty-first century has witnessed growing attention on High Performance Work System as a tool of performance optimization both in qualitative and quantitative terms. HPWPs do not only have positive impact on productivity and profitability of an employee but the practices are also found to have favourable effect on employee morale, satisfaction and commitment level.

Further, employees' awareness and perception is marked to play an important role in ensuring optimum performance. At the same time emphasise is given to streamline differences based on personal characteristics. Variation across individual characteristics like gender, age, experience etc has been studied in great details. Harter et al (2002) and Goddard (1999) asserted that employee engagement with performance system is resultant of individual factors. Ferguson (2007) stated that individual differences have significant effects on employees' approach towards this revolutionary work system. The present research paper tends to discuss individual differences across four personal characteristics for employees' awareness and perception for effectiveness of HPWPs.

LITERATURE REVIEW

The previous researches have been studied in great depth. The present literature review is divided into three parts. First part gives adequate description of constructs of High Performance Work System. Secondly importance of employees' awareness level and that of employees' perception has been studied. And lastly significance of individual differences has been discussed briefly.

HIGH PERFORMANCE WORK SYSTEM

There is no uniformity among scholars for the definitions and components of HPWPs (Goddard, 1999). Delaney and Goddard (2001) stated that combination of high performance practices may be referred as 'High performance work system', 'Alternate work practices', or 'Flexible work practices' etc. At large they are often identified as bundle of practices that leads to value creation and value enhancement for an organisation. Further various researchers have given different set of high performance practices for distinct settings. The U.S. Department of Labour (1993) refereed high performance work practices to include: Extensive recruitment and selection process, Training procedures, Formal information sharing, Attitude assessment, Job design, Grievance procedures, Labour-management participation programs, Performance appraisal, Promotion and Incentive compensation systems. Pfeffer (2005) included sixteen interrelated HR practices that tend to achieve success through the way they manage and interact with the people. Further he expanded his list of 16 High Performance Work Practices to 26 after few years of cross and temporal studies. He included Employment security, Selective hiring of new personnel, Self-managed teams and decentralization of decision making, High compensation, Extensive training etc. With time practices under High Performance Work System keeps on increasing. Boxall and Macky (2009) introduced as many as thirty-nine practices in their study. Further Yadav and Yadav (2013) conducted study using thirty seven High Performance Work Practices. Taking clue from previous studies and compatibility for Indian settings the present study takes 35 High Performance Work Practices into consideration.

Employees' Awareness and Perception

Awareness refers to the employees' clear understandings about practice or phenomena in question. Familiarity and understanding helps in proper implementation of any work system. Danhower & Lust (1996) reported that the success of any compensation or fringe benefit package depends on the employees' awareness. Lower level of employees' awareness level may lead to total wastage of any costly compensation package. Awareness reduces resistance from the employees and hence institutionalization of new work system becomes easier. Yadav and Yadav (2013) concluded that employees' perception and their willingness to adapt new work system have significant effect on success of High Performance Work System. Takeuchi and Takeuchi (2013) stated that employees' perception may affect work behaviour and outcome, thus interest on exploring of employees' perception has increased considerably in recent times. Moreover Collins and Smith (2006) found that studying employees' perception helps an organisation to understand employees' behaviour and aspiration in the organization. Combs et al. (2006) explored employees' perception in great detail. They found significant relationship between employees' perception of success towards ongoing change effort and perceived sense of competence. Further Datta et al. (2005) concluded that employee retention, revenue, sales and profits are correlated with employees' attitude and perception of work conditions. Nishii et al. (2009) also gave similar sort of conclusion. They elaborated that perception employees have of HRM practices is related with organisational outcome and productivity. Further countless other researches also indicate importance of employees' perception. A group of employees having positive and favourable perception for any practices is essential for optimization. Same is more relevant in the case of High Performance Work System as it consists of bundles of practices.

Differences in employees' perception could arise because employee tends to observe same situation or information through different cameras. They experiences same HRM practices differently. According to Nishii and Wright (2008) people have an inbuilt mechanism to filter external information. This filtering mechanism depends upon a number of factors like experience, attitude, belief system, aspiration, qualification, surroundings etc. Thus it differs from person to person. As a result of which same external information is filtered differently. Thus it elicits various attitudinal and behavioural responses. Although previous researches have highlighted employees' perception and their implication for HRM practices differently. But an elaborative study of employees' perception

and scientific bundle of HR practices termed as HPWPs is in nascent stage. In this light the present paper discusses employees' awareness and perception for effectiveness of 35 practices.

Personal Characteristics and HRM

A large volume of previous studies are available that explores interference of individual differences among various aspects of Human Resource Management. Researchers have claimed that success of any practice depends on degree to which employees are engaged with organisation. Researchers like Harter et al (2002) and Goddard (1999) asserted that employee engagement and employee loyalty is resultant of individual factors. Elaborating individual factors determinant of employee engagement, Ferguson (2007) stated that individual differences may not be trivial and could have significant effects on employee engagement. Kahn (1990) argued that psychological differences may have a decisive impact on individuals' capability to engage or disengage in their role performance. Individual experience, age etc. may shape an employee's ability and willingness to be involved and committed at work. People get engaged differently at work place depending upon their experiences of psychological meaningfulness, safety and availability in specific situations.

Moreover, Robinson (2006) argued that individual differences play a vital role in determining success of HR policies of an organisation. He explained that the process of perception is the key factor that commands the individual behaviour. And perception is defined by a number of independent individual variables like age, experience, education etc. Perception is defined by the way in which individuals make sense of their environment. Further perceptual process involves interpretation and responding to the events and people around them. According to Robinson (2006) individual employee or person categorises the raw data and makes sense of these input situations as per their own unique and personal biological, social and psychological framework of mind and exposure. Biological framework includes gender, inherited traits, habits etc. Psychological frame is reflected by one's personality, past experiences, knowledge, expectations and current needs, priorities and interests. Thus the author gave immense importance to individual characteristic as determining factors of awareness and perception of the employees.

The literature related to significance of demographical parameters is inconclusive. Few author reports that factors like gender, age, experience are

essential to deal for a HR manager while few others considers these factors as trivial and insignificant. Researchers like Rothbard (1999), Johnson (2004), Kapoor and Anthony (2013) illustrates the relevance of gender differences. But other scholars like Swaminathan and Ananth (2011), Perrin (2003) declares these individual differs as insignificant and negligible.

Another personal factor like employees' experience with the present organisation is also supposed to impact the efficiency of performance practices. It has been found that the longer employees stay with an organization, the less enthusiastic they become for HR functions (Ferguson 2007 and Truss et al 2006). In other words the experience and interest are found to have inverse relationship with each other. Swaminathan and Ananth (2011) also supported perceptual difference based on experience of the employee. But according to Perrin (2003) employees' engagement with HR functions is a continuous process that never ends and thus experience or stay of employee has no bearing on appetite of workforce.

Age of the employees is also considered as an important paradigm of individual difference. Milner et al. (2011) explored age based differences among five groups of employees categorised on the basis of age. The study examined psychological differences among groups as: emerging adults (less than 24 yrs), settling-in adults (25-39), prime-working years (40-54), approaching retirement (55-65), and retirement eligible (66 and older). Supervisor support and recognition, schedule satisfaction (flexibility and autonomy in one's work schedule), and job clarity were reported important for all age groups. Specifically, supervisor support and recognition had the largest effect for the two older groups, approaching retirement and retirement-eligible. While career development and promotions was significant for all age groups except the retirement-eligible folks. Job quality factor was most important among the two youngest groups of employees, the emerging and the settling-in adults. But on contrary to Milner et al. (2011), Swaminathan and Ananth (2009) refuted such age based differences.

In summary, it could be said that literature in the field of individual differences is split. Some suggest that individual differences like age, gender or experience shape up HR function while other refutes the same. Thus present study will have eight hypotheses to adjudge the individual differences based on age, gender, experience and educational qualifications of the employees. Further keeping all these and all other allied factors in view, the present study has been carried out with objectives and methodology mentioned hereunder.

OBJECTIVE, HYPOTHESES AND METHODOLOGY

The prime objective of the present research has been to explore the High Performance Work Practices from the lenses of individual differences. The incidental objectives of the present research were as under:

- To examine gender, age, experience and educational qualification based individual drivers of employees' awareness for HPWPs.
- To examine gender, age, experience and educational qualification based individual differences of employees' perception for effectiveness of HPWPs.
- To give deep insight into nine factors of HPWPs for individual variations.

The present study is based upon exploratory-cum-descriptive research design. Primary data is collected through a structured questionnaire consisting of 35 HPWPs. In addition to it, there are eight other variables related to personal information of the respondents. Stratified random sampling has been used to collect data from various manufacturing and service sectors organisations. The industries mainly includes banking, insurance, textile, BPO, sugar, shoe, consultancy, cold drink, rice, etc. Sample size is 400. The questionnaire used has been designed on a 5-point scale ranging from 'Ineffective' (1) to 'Highly Effective' (5) to assess employees' perception for effective of HPWPs. And another five-point scale measures employees' awareness level as 'Unaware' (1) to 'Highly Aware' (5). Employees were taken from top and middle level as they are more likely to encounter HPWPs. For analysis purpose, it has been strictly ensured that an array of manufacturing, service, private, public, Indian and foreign companies are approached. Further, while administering questionnaire, it has been ensured that data come from all categories like men, women, highly experienced to less experienced ones, aged personnel to fresh recruits, etc.

Cronbach's alpha comes out to be 0.89 and any value greater than 0.80 indicates significant reliability according to Field (2000). Field (2000) stated that higher value of Cronbach's alpha shows high internal consistency which is considered as the best method of examining reliability. Data related to awareness and perception among various categories as gender, sector, etc. is being tabulated and discussed. Factor analysis has been used to reduce data to bring broader dimensions forward. Here also appropriateness of data for factor analysis is ensured through KMO and Bartlett Test of Sphericity. Moreover F-test has been used to study the difference in awareness and perception across various extracted factors

Table 1: Profile of Respondents

Variable	Category	Frequency	Percentage
Gender	Male	240	60
	Female	160	40
Age	Below 25	53	13.25
	26-35	174	43.5
	36-45	74	18.5
	Above 45	99	24.75
Experience	Below 1	44	11
	2-5	78	19.5
	5-10	104	26
	11-20	94	23.5
	Above 20	80	20
Education	UG	144	36
	G	208	52
	PG	48	12

of HPWPs among various categories of respondents. Eight hypotheses have been used to explore the variations in awareness and perception of the employees. The hypotheses are

Hypothesis: 1

H0 (Null Hypothesis): No difference in the awareness level of male and female employees.

H1 (Alternate Hypothesis): Awareness of male and female employees differs significantly.

Hypothesis: 2

H0 (Null Hypothesis): No differential awareness for employees of different experience group.

H1 (Alternate Hypothesis): Awareness level differs significantly with experience.

Hypothesis: 3

H0 (Null Hypothesis): No difference in awareness level of employees of various age groups.

H1 (Alternate Hypothesis): Awareness level differs significantly with age.

Hypothesis: 4

H0 (Null Hypothesis): Awareness remains same for different educational qualifications.

H1 (Alternate Hypothesis): Awareness of differently qualified employee differs significantly.

Hypothesis: 5

H0 (Null Hypothesis): No difference in the perception of male and female employees.

H1 (Alternate Hypothesis): Perception of male and female employees differs significantly.

Hypothesis: 6

H0 (Null Hypothesis): No perceptual difference for employees of different experience group.

H1 (Alternate Hypothesis): Perception differs significantly with experience.

Hypothesis: 7

H0 (Null Hypothesis): No difference in perception of employees of various age groups.

H1 (Alternate Hypothesis): Perception differs significantly with age.

Hypothesis: 8

H0 (Null Hypothesis): Perception remains same for different educational qualifications.

H1 (Alternate Hypothesis): Perception of differently qualified employee differs significantly.

Data collected has been tabulated and variations have also been depicted. Further all nine factors of HPWPs and hypothesis have been subjected to ANOVA to explore individual differences. Prior to application of ANOVA, Levene's test for Equality of Variance is done. P value of .041 (less than .05) shows variance homogeneity and hence data is suitable for ANOVA.

RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

Hypothesis Testing and Description of Variation Based on Individual Differences

The present paper explores differences through eight different hypotheses. The hypotheses discuss the significance of genetic and

Table 2: Personal Characteristics based Variations in Awareness Level of HPWPs

Variable	Category	Mean	F-value	Sig.
Gender	Male	3.71	0.606	1.22
	Female	3.49		
Experience	Below 1	3.90	3.286	.044
	2-5	3.78		
	5-10	3.58		
	11-20	3.50		
	Above 20	3.48		
Age	Below 25	3.84	2.841	.028
	26-35	3.70		
	36-45	3.58		
	Above 45	3.39		
Educational Qualification	UG	3.48	3.890	.048
	G	3.77		
	PG	3.39		

acquired individual differences. Employees' awareness and perception are key determinant of success of any High Performance Work System.

Table-2 states that male employees (mean=3.71) are comparatively more aware for HPWPs than their female counterparts (mean=3.49). However F-value indicates that the difference in awareness is insignificant. Thus here alternate hypothesis i.e. there is no significant difference in awareness of male and female employee is accepted. Further ANOVA is applied to adjudge significance of difference in awareness level of employees of different age and experience group. Data reveals that awareness differs significantly for employees of different age and experience group. Interestingly, it is also observed that awareness decreases with age and experience of the employees. HPWPs are regarded as modern day's performance practices thus new entrant and relatively less experienced employees have higher familiarity and understanding of performance practices. It could be inferred that experienced and seasoned employees would create higher resistance to change towards HPWS. Organisations need to establish mechanism to increase awareness level of experienced workers. Further awareness level also varies significantly across employees with different educational qualifications. Surprisingly

graduate employees are found to have greater awareness than under graduate and post graduate employees. In nut shell it is observed that three out of four personal variables tends to act as a driver for employees' awareness for High Performance Work Practices.

Employees' perception regarding effectiveness of High Performance Work Practices is also studied to explore variations based on individual variables like gender, age etc. It is observed that employees' awareness varies significantly across all four variables taken in the study. Male employees with a mean value of 3.57 perceives HPWPs more positively than female employees (mean=3.12). Female employees seem to be less enthusiastic for HPWPs. It indirectly hints at perennial issue of equal opportunities and rewards for the women employees. As problems like stereotyping, glass ceiling, mistrust etc still exist in Indian corporate sector. Thus researcher suggests high performance practices practitioner to ponder upon this sensitive issue. The fairer sex employees need to be assured for equal benefits for adapting HPWPs. Moreover female employees are to be appropriately counseled specially for these practices. An organisation works upon two wheels i.e. male and female employees

Table 3: Personal Characteristics Based Variation in Perception for HPWPs

Variable	Category	Mean	F-value	Sig.
Gender	Male	3.57	4.028	.049
	Female	3.12		
Experience	Below 1	3.61	2.665	.024
	2-5	3.57		
	5-10	3.41		
	11-20	3.34		
	Above 20	3.38		
Age	Below 25	3.67	3.207	.040
	26-35	3.52		
	36-45	3.40		
	Above 45	3.21		
Educational Qualification	UG	3.30	2.087	.016
	G	3.57		
	PG	3.31		

so it requires equal contribution from both categories of employee for smooth ride. And any imbalance may become a serious issue especially in case of costly affair like High Performance Work System. Again mean value of employees' perception decreases with age and experience of the employees. Literature reveals that with experience and longer stay in organisation employees becomes habitual of organizational culture and practices. But a High Performance Work System demands institutionalization of new organizational culture and new processes thus seasoned employees may not consider HPWS as effective paradigm of performance maximization. A practitioner of high performance paradigm is advised to consider these differences while framing implementation policy. Single policy framework may not work well for employees of all age, experience etc group.

Segmentation of 35 High Performance Work Practices

35 dimensions of HPWPs are applied with principal components factor analysis. Dimensions with factor loading exceeding 0.4 is considered and included in the factor. KMO and Bartlett's Test showed a value of .719 which suggests that data is appropriate for factor analysis. Thereafter factor analysis was administered and nine factors were extracted which are discussed as under. Table-4 gives an illustration of practices chosen for a component. High Performance Work Practices included in various factors have been highlighted in bold. In order to load a factor minimum loading value of .4 is taken.

F-1: Reward Oriented HPWPs: It 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.

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

F-3: Value Creating HPWPs: The factor 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: It 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.

Table 4: Rotated Component Matrix

HPWPs	Component								
	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9
Practice-1	.314	-.540	.177	.486	.152	-.066	.004	.343	-.182
Practice-2	.528	-.407	.388	-.055	.032	-.359	-.054	-.001	.019
Practice-3	.729	-.347	.128	-.100	.197	-.186	-.110	.177	.032
Practice-4	.783	-.041	-.026	.122	-.062	.070	.050	-.046	-.266
Practice-5	.711	-.027	.250	.075	.157	.387	.078	.010	.198
Practice-6	.552	-.294	-.228	-.247	.114	.020	.230	.344	.635
Practice-7	.721	-.233	-.050	-.375	.007	.167	.296	.048	.032
Practice-8	.742	-.315	-.228	.019	-.004	.152	.140	-.109	.062
Practice-9	.498	-.202	.532	.319	.142	-.058	.173	-.266	.126
Practice-10	.596	.699	-.059	.179	.252	.190	.124	-.119	.354
Practice-11	.402	.716	-.002	.083	.103	.062	-.390	-.162	.012
Practice-12	.688	-.102	-.209	.780	-.059	.170	-.056	.040	-.285
Practice-13	.342	-.140	.074	.753	-.232	.334	-.138	.001	.012
Practice-14	.118	-.224	-.188	.624	-.200	.004	-.332	-.275	.030
Practice-15	.008	.025	-.124	.006	.027	.735	-.190	-.066	-.015
Practice-16	.202	-.170	.529	.004	.129	.312	.057	-.257	-.050
Practice-17	.372	-.239	.116	-.084	.769	-.166	-.073	.136	-.032
Practice-18	.415	-.159	-.268	.174	-.150	.641	.210	-.207	-.146
Practice-19	.472	-.008	.168	-.118	-.249	-.340	.039	.709	.040
Practice-20	.590	.007	.593	-.390	.318	.262	-.295	.017	-.023
Practice-21	.500	.459	-.122	-.163	.548	-.137	-.401	-.096	-.062
Practice-22	.534	.454	.275	.011	.180	-.221	-.097	-.136	.693
Practice-23	.518	.649	-.043	-.147	.580	-.004	-.077	-.007	.066
Practice-24	.481	.408	-.088	.009	.648	.057	.377	-.008	-.024
Practice-25	.321	.436	.153	.695	.093	.076	.738	.007	-.012
Practice-26	.510	.716	.061	.278	-.196	-.105	-.196	.618	.100
Practice-27	.392	.233	-.112	.794	-.058	-.099	.243	-.022	-.084
Practice-28	.534	.136	.459	.690	-.284	.062	.168	.068	-.267
Practice-29	.463	.213	-.231	-.050	-.243	-.255	.615	.138	.292
Practice-30	.516	.449	.635	.007	-.118	-.025	-.169	.173	.395
Practice-31	.523	.091	.573	-.185	-.247	.698	.256	.053	.043
Practice-32	.238	.464	.466	.017	-.161	-.084	.220	.796	.309
Practice-33	.614	.129	-.177	.126	-.292	.740	-.148	-.078	.003
Practice-34	.475	.406	-.202	.017	.012	.148	.530	.210	-.375
Practice-35	.440	.799	.027	-.029	-.125	-.061	.290	-.060	.045

F-5: Team Oriented HPWPs: Factor 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: It 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: The factor 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: It 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: It includes corporate social responsibility and surprise factor. The factor-9 has an Eigen value of 2.13 and it defines 6.088 % of variance.

Insight into Nine Extracted Factors

Nine factors extracted after factors analysis are studied differently to analyze variations in employees' awareness and employees' perception for HPWPs among four individual variables i.e. gender, age, experience and academic qualifications. Gender based variation in awareness level has been described below:-

Table-2 stated that gender based differences in employees' awareness for High Performance Work Practices are insignificant and hence the differences could be discarded. Here table-5 explores all nine factors of HPWS for gender based variations. Four out of nine factors shows significant differences between male and female employees. The factors are Reward Oriented HPWPs, Team Oriented HPWPs, Employee Empowerment HPWPs and Procedural Improvement HPWPs. Although mean value of awareness differs among man and woman employees but these variations are reported to be insignificant. It reflects that women employee have significantly lower awareness for modern HR practices like incentive pay, flexi timing, team reward, job rotation, job enrichment, team briefing, staff suggestion, job sharing, stock option plan, management by objective and quality circle.

Further variation in awareness level of employees of different age groups is studied. Difference in employees' awareness is found to be significant in case of six factors of High Performance Work Practices. The factors are Traditional HRM Practices, Employee Engagement HPWPs,

Table 5: Individual Characteristic Based Variation in Awareness for HPWPs (Factors)

Factor of HPWPs	Gender		Age		Experience		Qualification	
	F-Value	Sig.	F-Value	Sig.	F-Value	Sig.	F-Value	Sig.
F1	2.240	0.026	.790	.059	.06	.78	5.31	.000
F2	0.000	0.989	4.02	.041	.11	.63	.882	.065
F3	0.476	0.492	.521	.099	.37	.60	4.69	.002
F4	0.048	0.828	3.96	.021	5.2	.000	5.08	.010
F5	3.286	0.044	4.40	.004	3.6	.031	3.75	.027
F6	0.232	0.631	.652	.078	.27	.580	.650	.084
F7	4.008	0.036	5.11	.001	2.7	.044	.893	.078
F8	4.386	0.040	3.99	.049	4.8	.018	.584	.054
F9	0.071	0.916	3.60	.031	4.3	.002	3.97	.049

Team Oriented HPWPs, Employee Empowerment HPWPs, Procedural Improvement HPWPs and Psycho-Strengthening HPWPs. This is an important finding as experienced employees could be subjected to awareness enhancement program for only these six practices.

Five out of six factors of HPWPs are found to vary significantly across employees of different experience group. The captioned factors are factor-4, factor-5, factor-7, factor-8 and factor-9. Similarly five factors are reported to vary considerably across groups with employees having different educational qualifications. The findings are useful for High performance practitioners as they could adapt tailor made policies for employees of different age, experience or qualifications group. These findings are same as that of Yadav and Yadav (2013). They also concluded that employees' awareness varies with age and experience of the employees. However they also reported that gender variation also affects awareness of the workers but the present study does not endorse this finding.

Employees' perception regarding effectiveness of High Performance Work Practices has been studied for variations among individual characteristics like gender, age, experience etc. Five factors i.e. Reward oriented HPWPs, Value creating HPWPs, Team oriented HPWPs, Procedural improvement HPWPs and Psycho-Strengthening HPWPs reported significant perceptual difference among male and female employees. Now combining results of table-4 and table-5, three factors i.e. factor-1, factor-5 and factor-8 shows significant variations in both awareness and perception for male and female workers. Awareness and perceptual mean is greater for male employees (Shown in table-2 and

Table 6: Individual Characteristics Based Variation in Perception for HPWPs (Factors)

Factor of HPWPs	Gender		Age		Experience		Qualification	
	F-Value	Sig.	F-Value	Sig.	F-Value	Sig.	F-Value	Sig.
F1	1.250	.048	3.102	.041	.0471	0.78	5.310	.014
F2	0.147	.897	4.872	.024	.0785	0.63	0.882	.087
F3	6.250	.012	0.058	.087	1.574	.047	4.697	.020
F4	0.587	.587	0.044	.097	3.421	.028	5.081	.012
F5	3.570	.033	6.589	.001	1.274	.040	3.750	.031
F6	0.058	2.35	4.879	.024	0.047	.580	0.650	.098
F7	0.554	.054	0.069	.078	3.875	.034	0.893	.065
F8	3.110	.027	5.542	.011	1.124	.048	0.584	.078
F9	1.120	.044	2.879	.036	5.542	.011	3.976	.034

table-3). Hence it is advised to HR practitioners to focus on counseling, education and awareness of women employees especially for reward, value creating and procedural improvement practices.

Six factors of High Performance System i.e. Factor-1, 2, 5, 6, 8, 9 shows significant variations among employees of different age groups. Combining results of table-4 and table-5, four dimensions of HPWS i.e. Traditional HRM practices, Team oriented HPWPs, Procedural Improvement HPWPs and Psycho-Strengthening HPWPs illustrates significant difference in both awareness and perception regarding effectiveness of performance practices. It suggests that practices like staff suggestion team, team briefing, continuous improvement team, problem solving team, Corporate Social Responsibility etc have few takers among relatively aged employees.

Again six factors i.e. Value creating, Employee empowerment, Team oriented, Employee engagement, Procedural improvement and Psycho-strengthening HPWPs reflects significant fluctuations across groups of differently experienced employees. Five out of these six factors were also reported to have appreciable variation in awareness level. It is interesting to state that three factors- Team oriented, Procedural improvement and Psycho-strengthening HPWPs shows significant differences in both awareness and perception for gender, age and experience. These three performance boosting practices could be given preference during dealing with awareness and perceptual imbalance in the company. The result hints

towards complacency factor with job security and high compensation after spending an appreciable time with the company. With time an employee becomes habitual to manage work and personal life effectively. And also with kids growing older, an employee is no longer fascinated with facilities of better work life balance. The findings are complementary with Maslow's need hierarchy as most of these constructs point towards lower level of needs like physiological, safety or social. Here researcher advises to implement policies that promote empowerment or self realization of the experienced employees. The organisation might need different set of practices to enforce engagement for employees with different experiences.

An organisation is required to manage diversity to develop a team of highly and equally engaged employees. Research would also suggest certain measure to accommodate variations in the firm. Robinson et al. (2007) stated that HR practices must be considered as two-way proposition, thus differences must be appreciated in communication and other means of interaction. Individual difference does not allow all employees to sail in the same boat. Different needs and expectations of people of different age, gender, qualification commands different treatment (Levinson, 2007).

CONCLUSION

A wide spectrum of researches provides a good combination of theoretical and practical insight into various tenants of individual differences. But still the concept remains inconclusive with few scholars supporting the difference and few others negating the differences. The present study provides a good explanation of variation in employees' awareness and perception regarding HPWPS based on gender, age, experience and qualification of the employees. Practitioners have been suggested with various mechanisms to deal with differences based on individual variables. The findings and suggestions have significant bearing for both organisations and for employees also. On one hand organisations would be able to develop loyalty and longevity among employees and on other hands employees' needs and aspirations could be catered in better way. The present study goes one step ahead to existing studies in two ways. Firstly questionnaire inscribes as many as thirty five high performance practices which were later on reduced to nine factors via applying factor analysis. The factors present a comprehensive and holistic picture of status of High Performance Work System. Secondly the present paper is not only explores the significance of the variations for overall HPWS

but nine factors of high performance paradigm are also subjected to statistical introspection. It provides in depth and adequate explanation for differences. For inference, although gender based differences (awareness level) have been found insignificant but still few constructs are found to have significant differences. Now an organisation can accommodate these factors to have equally aware male and female employees. Depending upon present study future researcher could devote their time and energy on elaborating the causes behind differences based on individual constructs. One can explore how and why perception varies across both genetic and acquired differences. What could be its implications and how it could be minimized? Further other modes of individual differences like income, personality type, background (Urban-Rural) could also be given serious thoughts in this regards.

REFERENCES

- Harter, J. K., Schmidt, F. L., & Hayes, T. L. (2002). Business unit level outcomes between employee satisfaction, employee engagement and business outcomes: a meta-analysis. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 87(2), 268-279.
- Kahn, W. A. (1990). Psychological conditions of personal engagement and disengagement at work. *Academy of Management Journal*, 33(4), 692-724.
- Perrin, T. (2003). *Working today: Understanding what drives employee engagement*. Towers Perrin, Stamford, CT.
- Robinson, J. (2006). A caterpillar dealer unearths employee engagement. Retrieved from <http://gmj.gallup.com> (accessed on September 20, 2010).
- Rothbard, N. (1999). Enriching or Depleting: The Dynamics of Engagement in Work and Family. Dissertation Abstracts International US: University Microfilm International.
- Truss, C., Soane, E., Edwards, C., Wisdom, K., Croll, A., & Burnett, J. (2006). *Working Life: Employee Attitude and Engagement*. Chartered Institute of Personnel and Development.
- 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.
- Collins, C. J., & Smith, K. G. (2006). Knowledge exchange and combination, the role of human resource practice in the performance of high technology firms. *Academy of Management Journal*, 49(3), 544-560.

- Combs, J. G., Ketchen, D. J., Jr., Hall, A. T., & Liu, Y. (2006). Do high performance work practices matter? A Meta analysis of their effects on organizational performance. *Personnel Psychology*, 59(3), 501-528.
- Datta, D. K., Guthrie, J. P., & Wright, P. M. (2005). Human resource management and labor productivity, does industry matter? *Academy of Management Journal*, 48(1), 135-145.
- Delaney, J. T., & Godard, J. (2001). An industrial relations perspective on the high performance paradigm. *Human Resource Management Review*, 11(4), 395-429.
- 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.
- Nishii, L., & Wright, P. (2008). Variability within organizations: Implications for strategic human resource management. In: *The people make the place: Dynamic linkages between individuals and organization*. (pp. 225-248). D.B. Smith (Ed.). New York: Taylor and Francis Group.
- Nishii, L., Lepak, D. P., & Schneider, B. (2009). Employee attributions of the 'why' of HR practices: Their effects on employee attitudes and behaviors, and customer satisfaction. *Personnel Psychology*, 61(3), 503-545.
- Pfeffer, J. (2005). Producing sustainable competitive advantage through the effective management of people. *Academy of Management Executive*, 19(4), 95-106.
- Yadav, S. K., & Yadav, D. (2013). Exploring HPWPs in Indian organizations. *Maharaja Agarshen Journal of Management*, 12(2), 112-110.