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Abstract
This paper aims to determine the role of relational coordination among employees in improving the performance efficiency in relation to unit-level performance in the banking sector of Pakistan. Underpinning on relational coordination theory, this paper examines the relationships between various Human Resources (HRM) practices in predicting relational coordination that affects unit-level performance in highly interdependent work settings. This research has been conducted in the banking sector of Pakistan. Employees’ perceptions about the extent of seven identical HRM practices and relational coordination are obtained through a personally administered survey in 218 sample branches. Utilizing hierarchical regression, empirical evidence indicate that various HRM practices have different effects in predicting relational coordination in terms of communication and relationship ties among bank branches. Results show that both communication and relationship ties of relational coordination are significantly related to branch level deposits, advances and overall profitability. These findings provide novel contributions to HRM and performance literature, suggesting what needs to be done in terms of HRM practices that can result in improving the potential of enhancing communication and relational ties of relational coordination among employees. This study concludes that a coordinated approach to HRM practices and relational coordination on the part of bank’s HRM department to liaison with branch management and develop better levels of communication and relational ties that would ultimately lead to higher performance.
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Previous research has provided compelling evidence linking systems of human resource management practices to organizational performance (Arthur, 1994; Becker & Gerhart, 1996; Combs et al., 2006; Delery&Doty, 1996; Gong et al., 2009; Huselid, 1995). Although there is a general agreement that systems of HRM practices affect performance outcomes, researchers continue to ask how HRM practices affect performance outcomes (Becker & Gerhart, 1996; Lepak, 2007).

Researchers have suggested that an accurate understanding of the links between HRM practices and performance outcomes is needed in order to make accurate inferences regarding the HRM and performance relationship (Guest, 1997; Wall &Wood, 2005). Researchers have often assumed two broad perspectives of “system approach” and “strategic perspective” to examine the link between HR practices and performance outcomes. In the system approach, the focus has shifted from individual HR practices to an overall large-scale focus on the set of HR practices.
and organizational outcomes (Bowen & Ostroff, 2004), while the strategic perspective mainly focuses on how the firm’s HR practices are consistent with the strategic direction of the organization. Taking these perspectives together, the links between HR practices and performance have been conceived in a variety of ways (Wall & Wood, 2005). Despite the fact that these perspectives assumed multilevel relationships between HR practices and take a macro approach.

Coordination is a term frequently used in the literature to understand a process through which various activities of a job are accordingly regulated and interlinked (Faraj & Xiao, 2006). Traditionally, coordination has been considered by theorists to be an information-processing challenge (e.g. Galbraith, 1977; Tushman & Nadler, 1978). Over time, the term coordination emerged to be considered as a relational process as well, including shared perceptions of the work and its context (Crowston & Kammerer, 1998; Faraj & Sproull, 2000). Relational coordination is considered to be a developing theory for distinguishing the relational dynamics of coordination. Theorists such as Malone and Crowston (1994) have advocated the importance of relationships for jobs that require coordination, basing their argument on the premise that “coordination is the management of task interdependence” (p. 90). Thus, it is essential to clarify exactly what is implied by relational coordination. The word relational coordination is generally understood to mean coordination among group members informed by relationships in the performance of interdependent work (Gittell, 2001). Together, these networks of communicating and relating can be considered to provide a structure of firm social capital, which is likely to improve firm performance (Leana & Van Buren, 1999). Relational coordination reflects the degree to which members are aware of the relationship between their role and the functioning of the whole, as well as an understanding of other fellow members in performing the work processes. Gittell, Seidner and Wimbush (2010) found that relational coordination among multiple workgroups mediated the effect of HPWS on key performance outcomes.

**HPWS and their Relationship with Performance**

A large body of the HRM literature suggested that HRM practices have had a compelling impact on organizational performance (Arthur, 1994). There are several theoretical perspectives explaining the relationship between HPWS and performance (e.g. Appelbaum et al., 2000). Over recent decades the RBV and the AMO framework provided a foundation to theoretically understand the link between HRM and organizational performance.

In the last few years, researchers have tended to focus on investigating the process through which HR practices affect organizational performance, often referred to as the “black box” in the
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HRM literature (Boselie et al., 2005). However, there is a lack of consensus with regards to the causal link through which HPWS influence performance. Several models are based on the assumptions that better HR practices are considered to result in highly committed, motivated, and better skilled employees, who, in return can be more productive to affect performance (Ostroff & Bowen, 2000). Research suggests that organizations can initiate and assist employee-based capabilities through high performance work practices (Wright et al., 2001), and that the suitability of a set of HRM practices depends on the capability that an organization is contesting to promote (Snell et al., 1996).

In this view, HRM systems are expected to enhance performance by improving the knowledge, skills, and abilities of employees (KSA), enabling them to better use their efforts in service of organizational goals, and providing them with motivation to exert greater effort to perform their jobs. A considerable number of HRM studies propose that HRM systems devised to improve employees’ skills, motivation, and performance are related to higher productivity (Datta et al., 2005), lower employee turnover, and improved organizational performance (Huselid, 1995). Explaining the processes through which HRM systems influence performance, researchers have pointed that high performance work practices function through their impact on (a) improving employees’ skills, knowledge, and abilities, (b) motivating employees to exert effort, and (c) providing them opportunities to perform their work (Combs et al., 2006). In sum, HRM systems influence performance through knowledge, skills, and abilities required by employees to perform, motivation and opportunity to express their talent in the performance of their jobs. Together, these processes enhance job satisfaction, and support employees in working effectively and making effective decisions, thus decreasing employee turnover and enhancing organizational performance (Becker et al., 1997).

Relational Coordination as a Causal Mechanism between HPWS and Performance

Several studies have considered coordination to be a relational process (Bechky, 2006), and have suggested that both communication and relationship ties among employees are vital for achieving organizational performance, particularly when work is highly interdependent (Adler et al., 2008; Gittell, 2000). From this perspective HPWS can be seen as a way to develop the employee relationships that are needed to achieve effective coordination. For instance, Gant et al. (2002) pointed out that high performance work practices affect the social networks of employees. The findings of Gant et al. (2002) indicated that as a result of HPWS such as selection, training and development, job design, team work and communication, employees have more substantial communication networks and showed higher performance. These results suggest that the social system of
relationships might comprise the link between HPWS and firm performance outcomes.

**Conceptual Model and Research Questions**

This study proposes that HPWS designed to foster the degree of relational coordination will result in enhanced firm performance. Figure 1 illustrates a multi-level model of the processes associating HPWS with organizational performance. In this model the first research question is proposed that HPWS positively predict the degree of relational coordination among employees at individual, functional and unit levels. To explore the mechanism through which HPWS affect organizational performance, the second research question proposed that HPWS affect relational coordination among employees at the branch level, and the degree of relational coordination in turn mediates the impact of HPWS on overall branch performance, suggesting a relational link through which HPWS work. The proposed hypotheses of this study are tested with data obtained from multiple sources including managers, officers from operations, and credit and cash functions across 218 bank branches.

**Figure 1. Research Framework**

**Research Methodology**

**Setting**

This research used survey research design with a correlational approach to study the relationships between HPWS, RC and branch level performance outcomes (Rungtusanatham et al., 2003). A self-completion survey was administered to a large sample of bank officers working in operations, credit, and cash functions at a branch level. This study adopted predictive research design to determine the influence of HPWS on performance (Wright et al., 2005). For this purpose, in the first phase, employees’ responses about the extent of HPWS and relational coordination were collected through a personally administered questionnaire from 218 bank branches. In the second phase, the bank performance at the unit level was obtained subsequently after the completion of bank’s financial year.

**Measurement of Variables**

**HPWS Unitary Index.** This study follows an additive way of aggregating HPWS index (Ostroff & Bowen, 2000). Researchers have considered additive approach as more comprehensive that endures missing practices and reflects the whole composition of the system (Becker & Gerhart, 1996). Therefore, consistent with the HPWS
literature, subscale scores were calculated by averaging across all items of the same HR practice (Zacharatos et al., 2005). An average across the seven individual practices was used to create an index of HPWS for each respondent. The subscale aggregation method for each practice and HPWS index were justified by the high value of internal consistency across scales.

**Relational Coordination.** RC was measured using the RC survey from Gittell (2001). The RC survey is a fully validated seven question instrument that measures the communication and relationship ties between participants around the focal work process in highly interdependent work settings. Responses to these items were measured using a 5-point Likert scale. Subscale aggregation was followed to calculate an index of relational coordination for each respondent, functions, and branches across all items of the RC survey.

**Branch Performance Measures.** Bank performance was assessed in relation to making use of capital and labor to generate deposits and advances. Financial information about the branch performance in terms of deposits/staff, growth in deposits, growth in advances, advances/ deposits, profit/staff, and growth in profit were collected from 218 branches for three years. Overall, these financial measures have been adopted for their capability to assess bank management efficiency, liquidity, profitability and bank’s capital adequacy (Paradi et al., 2011).

**Participants, Sample, and Data Collection**

This research has been administered in the banking sector of Pakistan. Being the 36th largest country by area (796095 square km) with an estimated population of 183 million (2011), it was difficult to reach all banks in the country. Therefore, in order to obtain an illustration of the whole population, a large bank with a nationwide branch network of more than 1300 branches and agency relationship with more than 3000 banks worldwide was selected for this study (State Bank of Pakistan, 2012).

Information about the extent of HPWS and relational coordination was obtained from managers and officers working in operations, credit and cash functions in a sample of 340 branches. Firstly it was decided to include bank branches of central Punjab, federal areas Islamabad, and Khyber Pakhtunkhwa for the survey. Secondly, a random sample of 45% branches was drawn from each area to represent proportionate participation of branches from all over the country. On the basis of 45% proportionate sampling, a sample of 340 branches was drawn from a total of 755 branches in Punjab, Islamabad, and KPK. These branches were surveyed during August to October 2011. Overall response rate for the HPWS and relational coordination surveys was 64%.
Overall, 3500 questionnaires were distributed among employees. Two separate questionnaires were developed for manager(s) and officers in operations, credit, and cash functions to seek perceptions about HPWS and relational coordination both within and between various functions at the branch level. In total, 2280 questionnaires were returned, of which 1563 questionnaires were usable. Branch level performance data was collected and matched with surveyed branches after six month following the survey. Overall, 120 branches provided performance data that matched the performance criteria of common key performance indicators.

Reliability and Validity

Reliability analysis was conducted using Cronbach alpha coefficient and inter-rater correlation coefficients (ICC 1 and ICC 2) to establish the internal consistency of the items for each scale. In addition to reliability, interrater agreement (IRA) was computed to determine the validity of the extent of HPWS and the degree of relational coordination as a unit level construct.

Table 1 provides reliability analysis results for the extent of HPWS and the degree of relational coordination scales. In this study, Cronbach alpha coefficient values for each scale are approximately equal of more than the recommended level of 0.7. Cronbach alpha coefficients for the overall extent of HPWS and the degree of relational coordination scales were 0.894 and 0.851 respectively.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Survey Items</th>
<th>No of Items</th>
<th>Cronbach Alpha</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Job Security</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0.611</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Extensive Training</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0.738</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Employee Participation</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0.812</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Role Clarity</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0.834</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Information Sharing</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0.701</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Performance Based Compensation</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0.601</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Performance Appraisal</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>0.854</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Overall High Performance Work Systems</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>0.894</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Relational Coordination</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>0.851</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Interrater Reliability (IRR) refers to the relative consistency in the ratings provided by various judges of multiple items (Bliese, 2000; LeBreton et al., 2003) and is commonly used to justify aggregation of data. In this study, individual perceptions were aggregated to the branch level so correlations among dimensions could be determined (Liao et al., 2009). For this purpose, interrater reliability (IRR) was calculated to determine considering the extent of HPWS and the degree of relational coordination as a unit level construct. In this study intra-class correlation coefficients (ICC), the most commonly measure of IRR, were computed.
to assure that aggregation of perceptions was empirically appropriate. The Intra-class correlation is commonly used when there are a number of different judges in the survey. The ICCs is interpreted as the proportion of the total variance within the data that is explained by the variance between judges. The value of the ICC ranges from 0 to 1, whereas the ICC value of zero suggests no consensus among judges and the ICC value of 1 propose a perfect consensus between judges. Two measures of intra class correlation coefficient ICC (1) and ICC (2) were computed for this study. In general, values from 0.05 to 0.3 are considered as common ICC (1) values, while ICC (2) values from 0.70 to 0.85 are being considered acceptable to justify aggregation (LeBreton & Senter, 2008). The values of ICC (1) and ICC (2) for both mixed and random models are reported in Table 2. For HPWS and relational coordination, ICC (1) values were well above the recommended level of 0.05 to 0.3 and ICC (2) also exceeds the recommended level of 0.70 and above. Together, these results provide justification for aggregation and treating HPWS and the degree of relational coordination as a unit-level construct.

**Table 2. Intra Class Correlations for HPWS and Relational Coordination**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Functions</th>
<th>ICC(1)</th>
<th>ICC(2)</th>
<th>ICC(1)</th>
<th>ICC(2)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>HPWS</td>
<td>0.245</td>
<td>0.894</td>
<td>0.227</td>
<td>0.884</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RC</td>
<td>0.450</td>
<td>0.851</td>
<td>0.415</td>
<td>0.833</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Validity Analysis**

Interrater Agreement (IRA) refers to the absolute agreement in scores provided by multiple judges for one or two items (LeBreton et al., 2003; Bliese, 2000; James et al., 1993). Measures of the IRA are used to determine whether scores provided by judges are identical in terms of their absolute value. An additive approach is followed in this study to measure the perceptions of employees regarding the extent of HPWS and the degree of relational coordination. Interrater agreement was computed to ascertain justification for aggregation and determine the similarity of ratings within bank branches in an absolute agreement sense. The IRA was estimated for each dimension score using indices developed by James et al. (1984). The most prominent estimates of the IRA are single-item $r_{wg}$ and multi-items $r_{wg(j)}$ indices. The values of IRA indices ranges from 0 to 1 with values of 0.70 have been considered as the traditional cut point (LeBreton et al., 2003; Lance et al., 2006).

Table 3 provides results of interrater agreement using uniform distribution for this study. The average $r_{wg(j)}$ of HPWS for managers, employees in operations, credit, and cash functions were 0.93, 0.91, 0.92, and 0.89 respectively. These values exceed the recommended value of
0.70 suggesting a very strong agreement for managers, operations, and credit functions, and strong agreement for cash function. With regard to relational coordination, the average \( r_{wg(j)} \) of the degree of relational coordination for managers, operations, credit, and cash functions were 0.91, 0.88, 0.87, and 0.87 respectively. Together, these reliability and interrater agreement (IRA) results provide significant support and justification for aggregating individual level scores to the branch level for the HPWS and relational coordination dimensions.

**Table 3. Interrater Agreement for HPWS and Relational Coordination (IRA)**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Functions</th>
<th>( r_{w gj} ) HPWS</th>
<th>( r_{w gj} ) RC</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Uniform distribution</td>
<td>Uniform distribution</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Manager</td>
<td>0.93</td>
<td>0.91</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Operations</td>
<td>0.91</td>
<td>0.88</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Credit</td>
<td>0.92</td>
<td>0.87</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cash</td>
<td>0.89</td>
<td>0.87</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Employee</td>
<td>0.91</td>
<td>0.88</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Findings about HPWS, RC and Branch Performance**

Results are shown in Tables 4 and 5. The model provides the results of the relationship between the extent of HPWS and the strength of relational coordination. The extent of HPWS showed a significant association with the strength of relational coordination with large coefficient. The results indicate that HPWS explained an additional 17% of variance in relational coordination beyond the control variables included in the model at the branch level. Regression analysis of HPWS showed significant positive association with all performance measures, including deposits to staff, growth in deposits and advances, advances to deposits, profit to staff and growth in profit.

**Table 4. Results of Analysis Testing Mediation of Relational Coordination**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variables</th>
<th>( \text{RC} )</th>
<th>Level of Deposits to Staff</th>
<th>Growth in Deposits</th>
<th>Growth in Advances</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>( \text{M1 (XM)} )</td>
<td>( \text{M2 (XY)} )</td>
<td>( \text{M3 (MY)} )</td>
<td>( \text{M4 (XM Y)} )</td>
<td>( \text{M2 (XY)} )</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Age</td>
<td>-.03</td>
<td>-13.47</td>
<td>-15.23</td>
<td>-13.49</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Qualification</td>
<td>-.03</td>
<td>-2.18</td>
<td>-3.70</td>
<td>-2.19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Experience</td>
<td>.01</td>
<td>15.70</td>
<td>17.85</td>
<td>15.71</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gender</td>
<td>.05</td>
<td>19.35</td>
<td>21.54</td>
<td>19.32</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Function</td>
<td>-.02</td>
<td>4.97</td>
<td>6.57</td>
<td>4.96</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Length of service</td>
<td>.03</td>
<td>1.09</td>
<td>1.48</td>
<td>1.11</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
In order to analyse whether RC mediates the relationship between HPWS and branch performance measures, a comparison of Model 4 and 2 for each measure shows that the regression coefficient of HPWS diminished significantly suggesting that RC mediated the link between HPWS and the branch growth in advances. Sobel test results also provided (z = 5.12, p < 0.001) evidence for the mediating role of relational coordination in the HPWS and growth in branch advances relationship.

Results from a comparison of Model 4 and Model 2, shown in Table 5, indicated that both HPWS and relational coordination are significantly related with profit to staff performance. However, the comparison between M4 and M2 revealed no significant reduction in the HPWS regression coefficient. Accordingly, these results suggest that the mediating role of relational coordination in HPWS and profit per staff was not convincingly supported by the data.

To establish mediation of RC with HPWS and branch growth in profit performance relationship, regression results from Model 4 were compared with Model 2 (Table 5). A comparison of two models indicated that the link between the extent of HPWS and growth in branch profit reported in Model 2 was weaker and diminished significantly. To further check mediation, the results of the Sobel test confirmed the mediating effect of relational coordination (z = 6.85, p < 0.05).

To test for mediation effects, regression results from Model 4 were compared with Model 2. A comparison of two models
revealed that the relationship between the extent of HPWS and growth in branch profit reported in Model 2 was weaker and diminished significantly. To further check mediation, the results of the Sobel test confirmed the mediating effect of relational coordination ($z = 6.85$, $p < 0.05$). These results provided support for the assertion that relational coordination mediates the relationship between the extent of HPWS and growth in profit. Overall, these findings suggested that relational coordination mediated the relationships between the extent of HPWS and branch performance measures including growth in the level of branch deposits, growth in advances, advances to deposits, and growth in profit.

### Table 5. Results of Analysis Testing Mediation of Relational Coordination

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variables</th>
<th>RC (M1)</th>
<th>Advances to Deposits (M2)</th>
<th>Profit to Staff (M3)</th>
<th>Growth in Profit (M4)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Age</td>
<td>-0.03</td>
<td>0.04</td>
<td>-0.13</td>
<td>0.15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Qualification</td>
<td>-0.03</td>
<td>0.07</td>
<td>-0.12</td>
<td>0.17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Experience</td>
<td>0.01</td>
<td>0.03</td>
<td>-0.12</td>
<td>0.13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gender</td>
<td>0.05</td>
<td>0.03</td>
<td>-0.11</td>
<td>0.11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Function</td>
<td>-0.02</td>
<td>0.03</td>
<td>-0.12</td>
<td>0.12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Length of service</td>
<td>0.03</td>
<td>-0.06</td>
<td>0.12</td>
<td>0.13</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| HPWS          | 0.45*** | -0.30***                 | 1.13***             | 74.20***              |
| RC            | --      | --                       | --                  | --                    |
| R             | 0.43    | 0.17                     | 0.20                | 0.18                  |
| R²            | 0.18    | 0.03                     | 0.04                | 0.03                  |
| Adjusted R²  | 0.17    | 0.02                     | 0.04                | 0.03                  |
| AR²           | 0.17    | 0.02                     | 0.03                | 0.03                  |
| F             | 28.25** | 3.57***                  | 4.06***             | 4.30***               |
| ΔF            | 185.7** | 19.31**                  | 13.36**             | 15.55**               |
| Sobel test    | --      | --                       | 0.03**              | 0.12**                |

Note. X = HPWS, Y = Advances to deposits, Profit to staff, Growth in profit. M = Relational Coordination (RC), *P < .05; **P < .01; ***P < .001

### Discussion

**HPWS and Branch Level Performance:** This research analyzed essential relationships which signify the promising role of the HPWS, the extent to which HPWS predict the degree of relational coordination...
among employees at various functional levels, and its impact on organizational performance in service settings. Prior studies have considered several HR outcomes as intervening variables in examining the relationship between HRM and performance (e.g. Katou & Budhwar, 2006; Snape & Redman, 2010). This study adds to these previous studies by featuring that the degree of relational coordination among employees act as an intermediate mechanism in HPWS and performance relationship. The results of this study showed a range of linkages between the extent of HPWS, relational coordination and performance outcomes at branch level. In this research, the extent of HPWS has shown positive and significant effects on firm performance. Findings from this research are consistent with the theoretical proposition in HRM research that firms with an appropriate set of HR practices in HPWS have a higher level of firm performance (Arthur, 1994; Huselid, 1995; Delery & Doty, 1996; Boxall & Macky, 2009).

Relational Coordination and Branch Performance: This study assumes that the degree of relational coordination among employees is expected to improve the complete process of service delivery in providing various financial services to their customers at the branch level. The findings illustrate strong evidence of a relationship between the degree of relational coordination and branch level performance outcomes. In total, four out of six performance outcomes for branch performance within the theoretical framework were predicted by the extent of relational coordination among employees. As shown in Table 5, the degree of relational coordination among employees indicated significant and positive associations with the branch level performance measures. Most importantly, the results of this provides validation from the perspectives of the financial sector in a developing country. The empirical findings suggest that relational coordination predicts a broad range of financial outcomes that are of high importance to bank performance. The findings of the current study are consistent with those of Gittell (2000) who found that improved quality of patient care and patients’ length of stay in the hospital were significantly related to the higher levels of relational coordination among care providers in hospitals.

Relational Coordination Linking HPWS and Performance:
The main question in this research was to examine the role of relational coordination among employees as an intervening mechanism in explaining the linkages between high performance work system and organizational performance. Following the three-step method of mediation analysis recommended by Baron & Kenny (1986) and Sobel’s test, results showed that relational coordination partially mediated the relationship between HPWS and performance. The findings in this study are in agreement with the findings of Gittell et al. (2010) which showed
that high performance work practices are positively linked with relational coordination among employees. Overall, the present study was designed to determine the effects of HPWS on organizational performance through examining the role of the degree of relational coordination among employees working in service sector settings characterized by interdependence, uncertainty, and time constraints. The findings observed in this study are consistent with those of other studies and therefore, empirically validates the direct relationship between the extent of HPWS and organizational performance. These findings are imperative for developing an understanding about how the extent of HPWS influences organizational performance through the mediation of relational coordination among employees, and also highlighting the significance of incorporating the employees’ perspective into the HPWS and performance relationship.

**Conclusion**

This present study was designed to determine the effects of HPWS on organizational performance in the banking sector of Pakistan. This study focuses on the essential process and the theoretical description underpinning HPWS and performance relationships and therefore has taken up the theory of relational coordination to examine the process through which HPWS influence organizational performance. The results of this study showed that the extent of HPWS predicted high level of relational coordination among employees at various levels. The findings also suggested that the degree of relational coordination was significantly associated to branch performance in terms of advances, deposits and overall profitability. The most important finding emerged from this research was that relational coordination among employees partially mediated the relationship between HPWS and organizational performance. This research contributes to the current understating of the linkages between HPWS and organizational performance in a service context. This study has made far-reaching implications for managers, bank management and HR professionals by providing insights into the process underlying the HPWS and performance relationships.

**Policy Implications**

An important feature of this study is the service sector context. The importance of HRM in service context may be higher than in manufacturing due to the nature of services, for example the production and consumption of services at the same time, and thus the greater involvement of customers in the production of service (Bowen & Schneider, 1988).

The finding of this study provides significant implications for managers and top management of the organizations whose focus is likely to be on achieving business goals and economic performance. Managing employees is an important element of a manager’s responsibilities in
every organization. Managers may accomplish several advantages from being trained in the essential competencies to implement an effective HPWS and providing an environment that promotes relational coordination among employees. In this regard, the HRM department has a key role in the selection and promotion criteria for managerial positions. The findings of this study suggest that when top management provides a coordinated approach and the HR function is entrusted to work with managers to establish the social context for productive HRM (Ferris et al., 1999), they are expected to achieve better performance results. In order to accomplish these outcomes, strong leadership is required from top management to ensure that the HR function, managers, and other support functions are coordinated and equipped with the necessary resources to implement HPWS effectively to support the development of relational coordination among employees.

Directions for Future Research

In general, there is plenty of scope for further advancement in research with regard to the theory of how HPWS affect performance outcomes. An essential issue for further research is not only to test the relationships between the HPWS and performance, but also to examine more aspects of HPWS (Guest et al., 2003) as well as different types of performance outcomes. Future studies should focus on testing of the theory with regard to the process of HPWS, its mediations its effect on organizational performance. This is vital not only to enhance theoretical understanding, but also to help employees to devise better understanding of improving performance by proper usage of HPWS. In this regard, future studies are needed to provide more understanding of the mechanisms that link HPWS and performance.
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