

The Impacts of High Commitment Work System on Employee Proactive Behavior: Mediating Roles of Work Meaning and Work Well-being

Jiaduan Zhang

School of Management Science and Engineering, Shandong Normal University, Jinan 250014, China

jiaduanzhang@126.com

Abstract

Based on self-determination theory and the broaden-and-build theory, with 322 employees from 40 enterprises in Shandong, Anhui Province and other places as the research object, this paper investigated the impacts of high commitment work system on employee proactive behavior and mediating role of work meaning and work well-being. The results show that high commitment system not only directly affect employee proactive behavior, but also indirectly influences the behavior through work meaning and work well-being. It reveals the relationship and action process of high commitment work system and employee proactive behavior, and provides beneficial enlightenment for enterprise to inspire the employees' proactive behavior.

Keywords

High Commitment Work System, Proactive Behavior, Work Meaning, Work Well-being.

1. Introduction

With the uncertainty of the business environment, the employee's proactive behavior plays a very important role in the process of rapid response to environmental change. Because of the expansion of self-management teams and autonomous work structures, proactive behavior is considered to be an important determinant of organizational success [1]. Proactive behavior refers to employees' spontaneous, future-oriented behavior that aims to change individuals and the environment [1]. Studies have shown that employee initiative can produce positive results, such as promotion of sales performance, personal innovation, overall performance and access to organizations Success.

At present, scholars pay more attention to the antecedents of proactive behaviors and make important contributions. However, there are still some shortcomings: mostly focus on the role of personal temperament, personality traits and immediate working environment, such as the sense of role, initiative personality, transformational leadership, job autonomy and so on. Less attention is paid to the broader contextual factors. Although some studies have found the antecedents of the individuals and situations that affect proactive behaviors, there are few theoretical studies on how these antecedents affect proactive behaviors and explain these relationships. Grant and Ashford called for the facilitation of employee proactive behaviors through contextual considerations [2]. Relevant research also points out that strategic human resource management system (SHRMS) is one of the most influential aspects of organizational situational factors influencing employee attitudes and behaviors, Few studies have explored how SHRMS can affect proactive behavior.

High-commitment work system (HCWS), as an important type in SHRMS, may have an impact on employee's proactive behavior. Unlike other SHRMSs, the core of HCWS is to work with organizations to increase employee commitment to employees' goals and to work spontaneously [3]. Which coincides with the spontaneity emphasized by proactive behavior because HCWS is a set of practices that emphasize the psychological connection between business and employees rather than the practice of controlling employees and obeying employees. Studies have shown that HCWS has a profound effect on employee behavior. Although previous studies have emphasized the impact of

HCWS on job performance and behavior outside of roles as a result of the act, perform assigned tasks and exhibit free behavior showing proactive behavior.

This study focuses on whether HCWS will promote proactive behavior and how it affects it. Based on the antecedents and results models of proactive behavior, two process variables were selected: working meaning and work well-being [4]. In addition, the role of work meaning and work well-being in HCWS and proactive behavior will be explored based on the theory of self-determination and the development of positive emotions-constructive theory to reveal the relationship and the process of occurrence.

2. Theoretical Basis and Research Assumptions

2.1 HCWS and Proactive Behavior

The latest study found that proactive behavior is a goal-driven behavior that is described as setting a positive goal and trying to achieve the process. This process has three paths: (1)"I can", refers to the individual's perception of the process and the ability to achieve the perception; (2)"I should", refers to the individual set and the implementation of the target power; (3)"I am energetic", positive emotion in the realization of the target to stimulate the role [3]. And HCWS through these three paths affect employee's proactive behavior: First of all, which the recruitment and selection of emphasis on personal characteristics and potential of the inspection, which in order to ensure that employees have a high sense of responsibility, competencies and development potential for the development of staff after the entry and improve the working methods to lay the foundation. In addition, HCWS focuses on the extensive training of knowledge and skills of employees and the guidance and management of the socialization process of new employees. It can improve the knowledge, skills and ability of employees so that employees can improve their work. Secondly, HCWS emphasizes internal promotion, employee participation and work autonomy, in order to effectively mobilize the enthusiasm of the staff, but also for employees to improve career planning, the establishment of employees and organizations between the exchange of mutually beneficial mode, so that employees have initiative to return to organization. Finally, HCWS through specific practices to convey the organizational commitment to employees, the establishment of the psychological link and reduce the psychological breach of staff, in the organization of trust and support environment, employees will have more positive emotional experience, Help to motivate employees to show more proactive behavior. Thus, the following assumptions are made:

Hypothesis 1: HCWS are positively related to proactive behavior.

2.2 Motive Process of Proactive Behavior

According to the proactive behavioral model of Bindl and Parker, individual differences and context variables affect proactive behavior, and there are also interactions, which affect the process of cognitive-motivation and affective processes [4]. From the perspective of motivation, two most notable cognitive-motivational processes that promote proactive behavior, one is the initiative and ability of individual perception, and other is desire or interest to perform proactive behavior. In emotional-related process, there is good evidence that affective can influence behavior. Based on the study of Fredrickson (1998), Parker (2007) proposed a model that states that positive emotions may influence proactive behavior through two mechanisms: one is the "extension" mechanism, positive emotions expand the instantaneous motivation and recognition the second is the "construct" mechanism, and cumulative positive emotions will affect more persistent cognitive motivation (eg, self-efficacy, the role of the self-efficacy, the role of the self- Oriented), and ultimately affect individual's ability, which in turn affects achievement of proactive goal [5,6].

From the perspective of self-determination theory, HCWS can improve the sense of employee's sense of work by satisfying the three psychological needs of individual autonomy, competence and relationship to promote internal motivation and internalization of external motivation. When employees perceive meaning from work, they have more interest and passion for their work, which in turn leads employees to pursue higher goals and take the initiative to change the status quo.

Therefore, HCWS will improve the work meaning of employees, and further stimulate the employee's proactive behavior. Thus, the following assumptions are made.

Hypothesis 2: work meaning mediates the relationship between HCWS and proactive behavior.

From the perspective of self-determination theory, HCWS invests employees through a series of HR management practices, encourages employees to participate, strives to establish a psychological link between the two, so that the basic needs of employees (that is, autonomy needs, competencies, attribution needs). Be satisfied, and then improve work well-being. From the perspective of extension-construction theory, the improvement of work well-being shows that employees experience more positive emotions at work, which will further expand the individual's immediate cognitive process and improve cognitive ability, and thus affect employee's initiative selection and implementation. Therefore, HCWS will improve the work of the well-being of employees, and further promote employee's proactive behavior. Thus, the following assumptions are made:

Hypothesis3: work well-being mediates the relationship between HCWS and proactive behavior.

3. Research Methods

3.1 Research Samples and Procedures

In this study, the questionnaire was used to collect data. The samples were mainly from Shandong, Anhui, Jiangsu, Beijing and Shanghai. Researchers through the 40 companies employees on-site distribution of the questionnaire, mainly related to the financial industry, services, high-tech industries. A total of 400 questionnaires were distributed, 355 questionnaires were collected, the invalid questionnaires were removed, 322 valid questionnaires and 80.5% effective questionnaires.

3.2 Measuring Tools

The selection of the measurement tool and the internal consistency coefficient in this study are as follows: HCWS, proactive behavior, work meaning Three variables are Likert-5 point scores, 1 means "very non-compliant", 5 means "very consistent ". Work Well-being is scored by Likert-6 points, 1 means "never", 6 means "all the time".

HCWS: 10 entries using Xiao and Tsui [7]. The internal consistency coefficient is 0.917.

Work Meaning: the use of Stege et al [8], prepared by the scale, including positive significance, job creation and good motivation three dimensions, a total of 10 items. The internal consistency coefficient is 0.905.

Work Well-being: Warr prepared with work of the emotional well-being questionnaire, a total of 12 items [9]. The internal consistency coefficient is 0.826.

Proactive Behavior: The scale of ative behavior developed by Parker and Collins [10], which was originally described primarily for the active work of sales and service employees, including individual innovation, take charge, problem prevention four dimensions, a total of 13 items, the internal consistency coefficient of 0.941.

Control variables: according to previous studies, demographic variables have a significant impact on employee-perceived HCWS, employee's proactive behavior, etc. In addition, some enterprise characteristics will also affect the selection and implementation of the enterprise's human resources system. Therefore, this study selected sex, age, education level, working years, corporate nature, business size and build years as control variables.

3.3 Statistical Analysis

In this study, Harman single factor test, confirmatory factor analysis and descriptive statistical test were used in AMOS 7.0. And then use SPSS 21.0, using multiple regression analysis method to further examine HCWS, work meaning, work meaning and proactive behavior of the four relationship.

4. The Results of the Study

4.1 Homologous Variance Test

In this study, employees from 40 enterprises were investigated. Each questionnaire was filled in by the same employee, and homologous bias may occur. In order to verify the impact of sample homology, Harman's single-factor test was used to explore all the variables of all the exploratory factor analysis. The first principal component obtained when not spinning was 32.15%, within acceptable range. Therefore, the impact of homologous bias in this study can be neglected.

4.2 Validity Analysis

In this study, HCWS, work meaning, work well-being and proactive behavior were all evaluated by employees. To test the discriminant validity of the variables, we performed confirmatory factor analysis using AMOS 7.0 and compared them between one-factor, two-factor, three-factor and four-factor models. The results show that the four-factor model is optimal, as shown in Table 1, $\chi^2/df = 2.412$, RMSEA = 0.071, T LI = 0.927, GFI = 0.916, RMR = 0.023. Therefore, the four variables have higher discriminant validity.

Table 1 confirmatory factor analysis results

Model	χ^2	χ^2/df	RMSEA	T LI	GFI	CFI	NFI	RMR
Four-factors	1465.823	2.106	0.071	0.927	.916	0.925	0.787	0.023
Three-factors	1903.691	2.723	0.088	0.792	.752	0.834	0.724	0.055
Two factors	2637.580	3.763	0.112	0.667	.601	0.785	0.617	0.062
One-factor	3242.563	4.619	0.128	0.654	.539	0.757	0.529	0.073

Note: HCWS: High Commitment Work System; Work Meaning: WM; Work Well-being: WWB; Proactive Behavior: PB; Four-factors Model: HCWS; WM; WWB; PB; Three-factors Model: HCWS; WM + WWB; PB; Two-factors model: HCWS; WM + WWB + PB; One-factor model: HCWS + WM + WWB + PB.

4.3 Descriptive Statistics and Correlation Analysis

In order to explore relationship between HCWS, work meaning, work well-being and proactive behavior. This study first conducted a correlation analysis, the analysis results are summarized in Table 2 below. The results showed that there was a significant positive correlation between HCWS and work meaning, work well-being, proactive behavior ($r = 0.490$, $p < 0.01$; $r = 0.373$, $p < 0.01$; $r = 0.614$, $p < 0.01$). There was also a significant positive correlation between proactive behavior ($r = 0.540$, $p < 0.01$). There was also a significant positive correlation between work well-being and proactive behavior ($r = 0.546$, $p < 0.01$). The correlation coefficients of all the variables are less than 0.7, and the Square (AVE) of each variable is significantly greater than the correlation coefficient of the row / column of each variable, indicating that the variables have good discriminative validity.

Table 2 Descriptive statistics and correlation analysis

Variable	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11
1 Sex	—										
2 Age	-0.059	—									
3 Education Level	.036	-.261**	—								
4 working Years	-.128	.709**	-.223**	—							
5 Business Size	.014	-.051	.203**	-.008	—						
6 Corporate Nature	.082	-.134*	-.119	-.238**	-.126	—					
7 Build Years	-.084	.177**	.068	.293**	.454**	-.324**	—				
8 HCWS	-.008	-.122	.095	-.068	.069	.036	-.067	(.917)			
9 Work Meaning	.034	.030	-.060	-.003	.025	.081	.069	.490**	(.905)		
10 Work Well-being	.041	-.104	.004	-.142*	.039	.014	-.070	.373**	.543**	(.826)	
11 Proactive Behavior	-.083	-.017	.167*	.004	.027	.057	-.061	.614**	.540**	.546**	(.941)
Average Value	1.52	1.69	3.00	2.15	3.45	4.51	2.72	3.45	3.59	3.41	3.30
Standard Deviation	0.50	0.74	0.87	1.30	1.83	2.77	1.29	0.81	0.69	0.93	0.68

Note: * means $P < 0.05$, ** means $P < 0.01$, *** means $P < 0.001$; diagonal parenthesis for internal consistency coefficient; a. Sex: (1) male, (2) female; b Age: (1) under 25, (2) aged 26-35 (3) aged 45-45, (4) over 45 years of age; c. Educational level: (1) high school and below, (2) college, (3) undergraduate, (4) master's degree or above; d. Working years: (1) 1 year or less, (2) 1-3 years, (3) 3-5 years, (4) 5-10 years; e. Business size: (1) 50 persons or less, (2) 51-100 persons, (3) 101-500 persons, (4) 501-1000 persons, (5) 1001-5000 persons, (6) More than 5000 persons; f. Corporate nature: (1) State-owned enterprises, (2) Sino-foreign joint ventures, (3) Cooperative enterprises, (4) Wholly foreign owned enterprises, (5) Partnerships (6) Limited liability companies (7) Personal business; g. Build years: (1) 6 years or less, (2) 6 to 10 years, (3) 11 to 15 years, (4) 15 years or more.

4.4 Hypothetical Test

The analysis results of the multivariate linear model are shown in Table 3. In Table 3, model 6 incorporates control variables and HCWS to test HCWS's relationship with proactive behavior. The results showed that there was a significant positive correlation between HCWS and active behaviors ($\beta = 0.607$, $P < 0.001$). Thus, hypothesis 1 is supported. Model 2 and Model 4 added control variables and HCWS to examine the relationship between HCWS and work meaning and work well-being. The results showed that there was a significant positive correlation between HCWS and the significance of work ($\beta = 0.520$, $P < 0.001$), and positively correlated with work well-being ($\beta = 0.371$, $P < 0.001$). Model 7 added two variables, control variables and work meaning and work well-being, to test the relationship between work meaning, work well-being and proactive behavior. The results showed that there was a significant positive correlation between work meaning and proactive behavior ($\beta = 0.366$, $P < 0.001$), and work well-being was positively correlated with proactive behavior ($\beta = 0.361$, $P < 0.001$). After completing the first three steps proposed by Baron and Kenny to test the intermediary role, Model 8 also incorporates three variables, namely, control variables and HCWS, work meaning, and work well-being [11]. The results showed that the effect of HCWS on proactive behavior was significantly decreased ($\beta = 0.607$, $P < 0.001$; $\beta = 0.391$, $P < 0.001$), suggesting that work meaning and work well-being partially mediated the relationship between HCWS and proactive behavior. Therefore, hypothesis 2 and hypothesis 3 are supported.

Table 3 multiple regression results

Explanatory variables↓ Dependent variable→	Work Meaning		Work Well-being			Proactive Behavior		
	M1	M2	M3	M4	M5	M6	M7	M8
Control variables								
Sex	0.034	0.045	0.021	0.029	-0.095	-0.083	-0.115*	-0.100**
Age	0.051	0.120	-0.011	0.038	0.000	0.080	-0.015	0.045
Education Level	-0.056	-0.092	-0.043	-0.069	0.197**	0.155**	0.233***	0.194***
Working Years	-0.057	-0.098	-0.129	-0.158	0.086	0.038	0.153*	0.107
Business Size	0.103	0.091	-0.040	-0.048	0.081	0.067	0.057	0.065
Corporate Nature	-0.003	-0.057	0.073	0.035	0.046	-0.017	0.021	-0.017
Build Years	0.118	0.178*	-0.071	-0.029	-0.102	-0.033	-0.120	-0.058
Argument								
HCWS		0.520***		0.371***		0.607***		0.391***
Mediation variables								
Work Meaning							0.366***	0.190**
Work Well-being							0.361***	0.315***
R ²	0.023	0.284	0.028	0.161	0.053	0.410	0.433	0.563
F	0.714	10.628***	0.871	5.120***	1.731	18.591***	19.803***	27.269***
ΔR ²	0.023	0.262	0.028	0.133	0.053	0.357	0.402	0.153
ΔF	0.714	78.232***	0.871	33.928***	1.731	129.383	78.680	36.976

Note: * means $P < 0.05$, ** means $P < 0.01$, *** means $P < 0.001$

5. Analysis and Discussion

5.1 Conclusion and Discussion

This article explores impact of HCWS on employee proactive behavior and expands existing research on antecedents of proactive behavior. Correspondingly, it also enriches the study on the impact of HCWS on employee behavior. In addition, in the driving mechanism of proactive behavior, too much attention has been paid to the impact of the cognitive-motivation process on proactive behaviors in previous studies. The main factors involved are the "ability to do" factors such as self-efficacy, role width self-efficacy and factors of "why", such as organizational commitment and flexible role orientation, etc. However, there are few researches on the emotion-related process. Based on self-determination and positive emotion expansion-construction theory, this study examines the roles and mechanisms of HCWS and proactive behaviors, taking into account the mediating role of cognitive-motivation and emotion-related processes in HCWS and employee proactive behavior, revealing the mechanism of action. The study found that: (1) HCWS has a significant positive impact on proactive behavior. (2) work meaning and work well-being partly mediate between HCWS and proactive behavior. Enlightenment on How to Stimulate Employees' proactive behavior. For example, a company can promote employees' proactive behavior through a series of human resource management practices such as selection, training, performance management, compensation management and work design. Organizations should attach great importance to the input and support of employees in the application of HCWS, and strive to create a harmonious and trustworthy working environment. This is conducive to inspire employees' intrinsic motivation, experience more positive emotions, and then demonstrate more proactive behaviors.

5.2 Insufficient Research

This study also has some limitations: (1) In the selection of samples, all the samples selected in this study are individual-level samples. Although the test of homologous variance is conducted, it is inevitable that there will be some sample homology problems, Future employee proactive behavior can be colleagues / superiors. (2) HCWS may be affected by the organizational culture and leadership style, which is not considered in this study. Therefore, future research can further consider the influence of organizational culture, leadership type and other factors. (2) cross-sectional data to examine the relationship between HCWS, work meaning, work well-being and proactive behavior. Without a rigorous causal analysis, future studies should consider the use of longitudinal data to analyze the dynamic relationships among the variables.

References

- [1] Crant J M. Proactive behavior in organizations [J]. *Journal of Management*, 2000, 26(3):435-462.
- [2] Grant A M, Ashford S J. The dynamics of proactivity at work. *Research in Organizational Behavior*, 2008, 28(28): 3-34.
- [3] Xiao Z, Tsui A S. When brokers may not work: The cultural contingency of social capital in chinese high-tech firms. *Administrative Science Quarterly*, 2007, 52(1): 1-31.
- [4] Bindl U K, Parker S K. Proactive work behavior: Forward-thinking and change-oriented action in organizations.[M]// Zedeck, Sheldon (Ed), (2011). *APA handbook of industrial and organizational psychology*. American Psychological Association, 2011:567-598.
- [5] Fredrickson B L. What good are positive emotions?. *Review of General Psychology Journal of Division of the American Psychological Association*, 1998, 2(3):300-319.
- [6] Parker S K. How positive affect can facilitate proactive behavior in the work place. *Academy of Management Conference*. Sage, 2007.
- [7] Xiao Z, Tsui A S. When brokers may not work: The cultural contingency of social capital in chinese high-tech firms. *Administrative Science Quarterly*, 2007, 52(1): 1-31.

- [8] Steger M F, Dik B J, Duffy R D, et al. Measuring meaningful work: the work and meaning inventory (WAMI). *Journal of Career Assessment*, 2012, 20(3): 322-337.
- [9] Warr P. The measurement of well-being and other aspects of mental health. *Journal of Occupational and Organizational Psychology*, 1990, 63(3):193–210.
- [10] Parker S K, Collins C G. Taking stock: Integrating and differentiating multiple proactive behaviors. *Journal of Management*, 2010, 36(3):633-662.
- [11] Baron R M, Kenny D A. The moderator-mediator variable distinction in social psychological research: Conceptual, strategic, and statistical considerations. In *Lead pollution causes and control*. Chapman and Hall, 1986:1173-1182.