

Article

## Impact of Human Resource Strategies on Workplace Environment and Employee Loyalty in Financial Institutions in Rajasthan

**Dr Atishree Bhardwaj**

Senior Research Analyst

The Global Foundation

atishree07@gmail.com

**Sudhanshu Kumar**

Head of Institute, CII School of Logistics

Amity University, Noida

&

Research Scholar, Noida International

University

Greater Noida, India

sudhanshu\_5237@rediffmail.com,

 Orcid ID: 0009-0008-2601-6517

**Dr. Ravi Gupta**

Assistant Professor

Department of Business Administration

S.S. Jain Subodh P.G. College

ravi93141@gmail.com

 Orcid ID: 0000-0003-1194-6179

### Abstract

This investigation explored the effects of human resource strategies (HRS) on workplace environment and employee loyalty within financial institutions in Rajasthan. Framed under the lens of integrated HRS, the analysis considered HRS as a cohesive framework—including hiring processes, skill enhancement programs, evaluation systems, incentive structures, staff involvement, and information sharing—aimed at not just overseeing personnel but also molding the internal dynamics of the entity. Information was gathered via a standardized survey from staff in chosen state-owned and independent banks in Rajasthan, allowing for contrasts in a varied financial landscape. Validated instruments measured staff views on HRS, workplace environment, and employee loyalty. A path analysis model was applied to evaluate the influence of HRS on the outcome variables. Results revealed that HRS exerted a favorable and meaningful effect on workplace environment, indicating that robust and unified HR frameworks correlated with more collaborative, inclusive, and growth-focused atmospheres in institutions. Additionally, outcomes demonstrated that HRS enhanced employee loyalty, suggesting that when staff viewed HR approaches as equitable, clear, and progressive, they exhibited greater dedication to their institutions. These insights affirmed HRS as a vital internal tool for defining both the atmospheric essence and motivational core of financial entities. The research adds to HRS scholarship with data from the Indian financial domain and delivers actionable insights for institutional leaders on crafting HR frameworks that concurrently bolster environment and loyalty.

**Keywords:** *Human resource strategies; workplace environment; employee loyalty; financial institutions; state-owned and independent banks; Rajasthan; integrated HRS*

### Article History

Received: 9 Jan, 2026

Revised: 20 Jan, 2026

Accepted: 11 Feb, 2026

Published: 9 March, 2026

## 1 INTRODUCTION

This research is embedded in the wider conversation depicting human resource strategies (HRS) as an essential operation that influences not merely output but also the core interactions within entities. In modern entities, particularly those in intellectually demanding and rivalrous settings, HRS elements like targeted hiring, organized skill building, growth-centric evaluations, just incentives, and transparent

dialogue are seen as pivotal drivers for fostering an encouraging atmosphere and a devoted staff (Pfeffer, 1998; Agarwala, 2003). Existing studies indicate that clusters of "advanced" HRS are tied to elevated entity output and creativity, primarily as they cultivate settings that promote teamwork, information exchange, and education (Lau & Ngo, 2004; Shipton et al., 2005). Concurrently, extensive research has illustrated that HRS affects staff's emotional and ethical bond to the entity via senses of equity, backing, and advancement prospects (Meyer &

Smith, 2000; Paul & Anantharaman, 2004). Nevertheless, numerous investigations often address either atmosphere or loyalty separately, or prioritize output results, resulting in limited combined data on how HRS concurrently molds workplace environment and employee loyalty in one analytic structure.

In this context, the current investigation aimed to probe HRS as a primary internal process by which entities nurture their atmospheric setting and reinforce staff's mental connection to the entity. Workplace environment here denotes the collective principles, standards, and conduct patterns that direct task execution and staff interactions, encompassing levels of cooperation, reliability, creativity, and engagement (Martins & Terblanche, 2003; Lau & Ngo, 2004). Employee loyalty is defined as the extent of mental affiliation and fidelity staff experience toward their entity, consistently associated with reduced attrition desires, increased voluntary contributions, and steadier output (Meyer & Smith, 2000; Gellatly et al., 2009). Theoretically, HRS is anticipated to affect atmosphere by indicating rewarded actions and principles, and to impact loyalty by forming staff's encounters with fairness, assistance, and sustained growth investment (Gelade & Ivery, 2003; Ordaz et al., 2011). However, there persists a demand for observational studies evaluating these outcomes jointly, employing a unified HRS concept, to discern if HRS truly acts as a consolidating driver for atmospheric and motivational results.

Given these deficiencies, the investigation centered on human resource strategies as the main forecaster and scrutinized its connection with two result constructs: workplace environment and employee loyalty, utilizing data from staff in the selected entities. The primary goal was to determine the degree to which HRS correlated with the caliber and nature of workplace environment, specifically if more solid and aligned HR frameworks manifested in more assistive, cooperative, and advancement-driven atmospheres. The secondary goal was to appraise the link between HRS and staff's employee loyalty, aiming to comprehend if staff in entities with

progressive and equitable HR frameworks displayed firmer affiliation to their entity. An encompassing goal was to produce proof illuminating the integrated function of HRS in concurrently forming the "intangible" foundation of atmosphere and the motivational base of loyalty, thus advancing discussions in the integrated HRS field on how personnel oversight systems generate and maintain internal states conducive to enduring success (Bontis, 2001; Birasnav & Rangnekar, 2009). Through tackling these goals in a unified observational framework, the investigation sought to enhance current understanding by showing how HRS linked to both the atmospheric setting and staff loyalty, and to offer grounds for better-informed leadership and strategy choices concerning HR framework design and execution.

## **2 REVIEW OF LITERATURE**

Scholarship on human resource strategies (HRS) reflects a comprehensive and steady attempt to associate HR approaches with principal entity results. Scholars have investigated if particular HRS are linked to division- or entity-level output (e.g., in production), which mixes of approaches most robustly boost output, how HRS frameworks vary across industries and regions, and how HRS and entity traits collectively form staff's employee loyalty. In summary, observational efforts imply that HRS is beyond an operational role, serving as an integrated driver that can affect efficiency, rivalry edge, and the robustness of staff's mental bond to the entity.

Initial proof on HRS and entity output reveals that specific approaches are generally favorably tied to output measures. Delaney and Huselid (1996) noted meaningful positive ties between HR approaches like skill building and targeted staffing and sensed entity output in profit and nonprofit samples. Pfeffer (1998) conceptually suggested seven "advanced" HRS—job stability, strict selection, autonomous groups and distributed choices, output-based high incentives, broad skill building, reduced hierarchy gaps, and extensive sharing of fiscal and output data—positing these components collectively elevate entity output, a perspective supported observationally by Ahmad and

Schroeder (2003). In production environments, Jayaram et al. (1999) reviewed primary suppliers to key North American vehicle makers and discovered HRS could be categorized into five unique elements, four of which strongly connected to rivalry aspects like caliber, adaptability, expense, and duration. Their further analysis stressed senior leadership dedication, explicit goal sharing, staff skill building, interdisciplinary groups, versatile training, staff independence and engagement, wider role designs, and accessible entity structures as essential HR drivers for enhancing production output and rivalry edge. Likewise, Cho et al. (2006) probed twelve HRS and indicated that entities applying engagement schemes, motivation systems, and pre-hire assessments often had lower attrition in non-leadership roles and superior output metrics, showing how targeted HR instruments can mold workforce results and efficiency.

A connected research thread stresses that HRS are not consistent across scenarios nor globally applied. Inter-regional and inter-sector analyses show HRS frameworks differ by nation, industry, and facility type, with "optimal" or high-engagement systems not spreading uniformly. Observational efforts in production facilities have shown notable variances in HRS extent and complexity between fields like equipment and vehicles, with equipment sector facilities frequently trailing vehicle counterparts in adopting advanced HRS. These insights underscore contextual elements—industry needs, regional workforce markets, and regulatory settings—in forming HRS design and implementation, even as the core output rationale seems largely comparable across contexts.

Throughout the analyses, HRS are regularly positioned as primary drivers for encouraging creative conduct at personal and entity levels. Skill building, incentives, and output oversight are repeatedly connected to creativity results (Kachelmeier & Williamson, 2010; Hon & Lu, 2014). HRS is not viewed as solely operational but as an integrated framework that develops abilities, drive, and chances for creativity. Dhar (2015) strengthens this by noting that "advanced" HR frameworks

indirectly positively affect creative conduct, implying cohesive approach clusters over solitary actions are crucial. In total, creativity is framed as a conduct result arising from personnel hiring, growth, assessment, rewarding, and oversight methods.

A secondary prominent motif is that the HRS–creativity connection is seldom straightforward; it is intermediated by employee loyalty, information, and personnel assets. Agarwala (2003) and Meyer & Smith (2000) demonstrate that HRS boosts staff loyalty—partly through process equity and sensed entity backing—which subsequently improves output and receptivity to creative conduct. Similarly, Ordaz et al. (2011) and Alvaro (2009) stress that HRS produces and molds staff's information foundations; this "distinct information" then propels creativity and ultimately output. Birasnav & Rangnekar (2009) and Bontis (2001) theoretically position this as personnel assets—information, abilities, capacities, and creative skills—wherein entities invest when yielding greater financial worth. Hence, loyalty and information/personnel assets serve as essential mental and cognitive links between HR approaches and creativity.

The scholarship also spotlights contextual elements conditioning if HRS truly converts to creativity. Visionary leadership stands out as a key propeller: Gumusluoglu & Ilsev (2009) identify a robust tie between visionary leadership and creativity, with outside backing adjusting this connection. Leadership approach is depicted as forming how HR approaches are comprehended, endorsed, and implemented. Architectural traits, like choice distribution, also count. Wan et al. (2005) indicate creativity positively ties to distributed structures encouraging risk, concept exchange, and trial readiness.

Workplace environment is another central contextual motif. Environment is addressed as both overt and covert, and as an intermediary between leadership and creativity (Sorros et al., 2008). Obgonna & Harris (2000) observationally connect cooperative leadership to a creative environment and enhanced output. Collectively, these efforts imply that HR

frameworks, leadership, and environment interlink to foster creativity.

A secondary primary research path scrutinizes HRS via employee loyalty and queries if loyalty is an HRS framework result. Multiple analyses find HRS impacts loyalty mainly through staff's views of equity, backing, and growth chances. Meyer and Smith (2000) illustrated that the HRS–loyalty tie was robustly intermediated by senses of entity backing and process equity in 281 staff samples. Conway (2003) broadened this by showing career phase adjusts the HRS–loyalty tie, with interplay effects for ongoing and ethical loyalty but not emotional. Paul and Anantharaman (2004) pinpointed staff-supportive settings, career progression, growth-centric evaluation, and thorough skill building as HRS positively tied to loyalty.

Sharma and Gupta (2020) investigate the dual impact of new age technology tools on the work-life balance of female employees in India's education sector, revealing that while digital tools offer flexibility and convenience, they simultaneously intensify work-personal boundary erosion and digital fatigue. Sharma and Gupta (2024) assess the interrelationships between work-life balance, job satisfaction, and employee engagement among academic professionals, providing empirical evidence that work-life balance is a significant determinant of both attitudinal and behavioural outcomes in higher education institutions. The study reveals that academics who perceive a healthy work-life balance report markedly higher levels of job satisfaction and organisational engagement, reinforcing the need for universities to prioritise employee well-being as a strategic human resource objective.

Job satisfaction varies across sectors, with banking and finance showing higher variability, indicating the need for stronger HR policies to create a supportive work environment and improve productivity (Sharma & Gupta, 2020). The findings on technology and work-life balance further suggest that unmanaged digital demands can increase stress and weaken employee well-being, making balanced HR interventions essential (Sharma & Gupta, 2020). Similarly, work-life balance was found to positively

influence job satisfaction and employee engagement, which are key drivers of employee loyalty and retention (Sharma & Gupta, 2024). Therefore, these studies collectively support the view that effective HR strategies in financial institutions can improve workplace conditions and strengthen employee loyalty in Rajasthan.

Contrastive proof further shows how HR frameworks function variably across entities and industries while forecasting loyalty. Shahnawaz and Juyal (2006) contrasted HRS and loyalty in a advisory/inquiry entity and a style sector company, finding HRS varied markedly, average HRS scores higher in style, and HRS meaningfully forecasted loyalty per entity and combined. Fiorito et al. (2007) indicated complaint resolution tools and staff engagement markers positively tied to loyalty, while incentive reductions negatively affected. Qiao et al. (2008), with 610 tech staff data, noted info exchange, skill building, hiring, and incentive oversight positively impacted loyalty. Gellatly et al. (2009) reviewed growth-centric, stability-centric, and incentive-centric HRS and showed staff views influenced affective vs. ongoing loyalty profile likelihood, implying entities can strategically mold loyalty nature via HR design.

Additional analyses add extra contextual or atmospheric layers to HRS–loyalty ties. Giauque et al. (2010) evaluated HRS in Swiss small firms and found entity backing, process equity, and entity reputation meaningfully affected knowledge staff loyalty, while choice setups, ability oversight, and pay contentment aspects lacked similar impacts. Hashim (2010) probed HRS from an ethical angle in Malaysian entities and found ethical-oriented HRS strongly tied to loyalty, accounting for notable variance. At wider entity levels, Gelade and Ivery (2003) showed HRS, work atmosphere, and business output interrelated in a retail financial network, highlighting HR frameworks, staff views, and output form a unified sequence. Lastly, Agarwala (2003) discovered that staff views of creative HRS introduction were strongest loyalty predictors, strengthening that "creative" HRS is output-boosting and loyalty-forming. Drawing from scholarship, the study advances these assumptions – H1: Human

resource strategies positively affect workplace environment in financial institutions in Rajasthan. H2: Human resource strategies positively affect employee loyalty in financial institutions in Rajasthan.

### 3 METHODOLOGY

The investigation employed a numerical, snapshot poll method to probe ties between human resource strategies (HRS), workplace environment, and employee loyalty in financial institutions. The inquiry occurred in Rajasthan, targeting state and independent institutions to grasp differences in HR guidelines, work atmospheres, and staff relations. Data came from staff in picked outlets of major state institutions like National Bank of India, Union Bank, and Central Bank, and independent ones like Private Bank A, Bank B, Axis Group, and Mahindra Finance, plus other licensed financial entities in the area. This spread enabled reflection of HRS and entity setting diversity in Rajasthan's financial field.

The focus group included leadership and operational staff directly encountering their institution's HRS and able to evaluate dominant workplace environment and personal loyalty. A convenience sampling method was applied, with outlets chosen deliberately for varied institution types (state and independent) and staff respondents based on access and participation readiness. A formatted, self-completed poll was handed out personally during operations, with prior outlet leadership approval. Involvement was optional and confidential; no personal details collected, and respondents advised answers for scholarly use only.

The poll had three key parts. The initial part gathered basic personal and role info (e.g., age group, sex, service length, role level, institution type) for

summary outlining and group pattern checks. The next part gauged staff views of HRS in their institution, spanning main zones like hiring and choice, skill growth, output review, incentives and benefits, choice involvement, and info flow. The final part measured workplace environment (e.g., transparency, teamwork, creativity backing, principal clarity) and employee loyalty (emotional and ethical bond, extra effort readiness, retention intent). All core items used a rating scale (e.g., from full disagreement to full agreement), with phrases drawn from proven tools in HRS, environment, and loyalty fields, adjusted via specialist input for financial context.

Prior to main poll, the tool was trialed with a minor Rajasthan institution staff group for clarity, pertinence, and wording, with small changes from input. In primary data phase, finished polls were reviewed for fullness and uniformity; unfinished or patterned ones excluded for data caliber. Kept responses coded and input to analysis program. Scale trustworthiness checked via consistency metrics, and factor explorations or verifications used as needed to confirm items that represented targeted HRS, workplace environment, and employee loyalty constructs.

To meet study goals, analysis centered on gauging direct HRS impacts on workplace environment and employee loyalty. A path framework specified HRS as forecaster and environment/loyalty as results. Path values, errors, and stats computed via suitable path modeling or regression with normalized estimates. Resulting values displayed positive, meaningful paths from HRS to workplace environment and to employee loyalty, offering observational foundation for viewing HRS as integrated driver molding atmospheric setting and staff bond in Rajasthan financial institutions.

### 4 RESULT

**Table-1: Models Info**

|                         |        |
|-------------------------|--------|
| Estimation Method:      | ML     |
| Optimization Method:    | NLMINB |
| Number of observations: | 412    |

|        |                                                                                                                                           |
|--------|-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| Model: | Human Resource Strategies = $\sim$ HIR1 + HIR2 + HIR3 + HIR4 + HIR5 + ENG1 + ENG2 + ENG3 + ENG4 + ENG5 + DEV1 + DEV2 + DEV3 + DEV4 + DEV5 |
|        | Workplace Environment = $\sim$ COL1 + COL2 + COL3 + COL4 + INN1 + INN2 + INN3 + TRU1 + TRU2 + TRU3 + TRU4                                 |
|        | Employee Loyalty = $\sim$ EMO1 + EMO2 + EMO3 + NOR1 + NOR2 + NOR3                                                                         |
|        | Workplace Environment $\sim$ Human Resource Strategies                                                                                    |
|        | Employee Loyalty $\sim$ Human Resource Strategies                                                                                         |

This table provides comprehensive information about the specification and estimation of the structural equation model used in the study. The model is estimated using the Maximum Likelihood (ML) estimation method with the NLMINB optimization algorithm, indicating that a likelihood-based approach was applied to obtain efficient and consistent parameter estimates while ensuring stable numerical convergence. The analysis is based on a relatively large sample of 412 observations, which enhances the robustness and generalizability of the results. Structurally, the model consists of three latent constructs: Human Resource Strategies, Workplace Environment, and Employee Loyalty. Human Resource Strategies is measured by fifteen observed indicators (HIR1–HIR5, ENG1–ENG5, and DEV1–DEV5), capturing HR practices, employee

engagement, and development dimensions. Workplace Environment is measured by eleven observed indicators (COL1–COL4, INN1–INN3, and TRU1–TRU4), reflecting collaboration, innovation, and trust at the workplace. Employee Loyalty is measured by six observed indicators (EMO1–EMO3 and NOR1–NOR3), representing emotional and normative aspects of loyalty. In the structural part of the model, Human Resource Strategies is specified as an exogenous latent variable that directly influences both Workplace Environment and Employee Loyalty, allowing the model to assess how HR strategies shape the work environment and employees' loyalty simultaneously. Overall, this table clarifies the estimation approach, sample adequacy, and the complete measurement and structural framework of the model.

**Table-2: Parameters Estimates**

| Dep                   | Pred                      | Estimate | SE     | Lower | Upper | $\beta$ | z    | p     |
|-----------------------|---------------------------|----------|--------|-------|-------|---------|------|-------|
| Workplace Environment | Human Resource Strategies | 0.192    | 0.0387 | 0.116 | 0.268 | 0.412   | 4.96 | <.001 |
| Employee Loyalty      | Human Resource Strategies | 0.258    | 0.0472 | 0.165 | 0.350 | 0.367   | 5.47 | <.001 |

This table reports the parameter estimates showing the impact of Human Resource Strategies on two dependent variables—Workplace Environment and Employee Loyalty—along with their statistical significance and confidence intervals. The estimate for the effect of Human Resource Strategies on Workplace Environment is 0.192, with a small standard error (0.0387) and a 95% confidence interval ranging from 0.116 to 0.268, indicating a precise and positive relationship; the standardized coefficient ( $\beta = 0.412$ ) suggests a moderately strong effect size, and the high z-value (4.96) with  $p < .001$  confirms that this effect is statistically highly

significant. Similarly, Human Resource Strategies have a positive and significant influence on Employee Loyalty, with an estimate of 0.258, a standard error of 0.0472, and a confidence interval from 0.165 to 0.350, again demonstrating precision and reliability of the estimate; the standardized coefficient ( $\beta = 0.367$ ) indicates a substantial practical impact, while the z-value of 5.47 and  $p < .001$  establish strong statistical significance. Overall, the table clearly shows that effective Human Resource Strategies significantly enhance both the workplace environment and employee loyalty, with consistent, positive, and statistically robust effects.

**Table-3: Measurement model**

| <b>Latent</b>             | <b>Observed</b> | <b>Estimate</b> | <b>SE</b> | <b>Lower</b> | <b>Upper</b> | <b>β</b> | <b>z</b> | <b>p</b> |
|---------------------------|-----------------|-----------------|-----------|--------------|--------------|----------|----------|----------|
| Human Resource Strategies | HIR1            | 1.000           | 0.0000    | 1.000        | 1.000        | 0.621    |          |          |
|                           | HIR2            | 1.112           | 0.1023    | 0.911        | 1.313        | 0.712    | 10.87    | <.001    |
|                           | HIR3            | 0.723           | 0.1156    | 0.497        | 0.950        | 0.378    | 6.25     | <.001    |
|                           | HIR4            | 0.998           | 0.1014    | 0.799        | 1.197        | 0.618    | 9.84     | <.001    |
|                           | HIR5            | 0.712           | 0.0892    | 0.537        | 0.887        | 0.489    | 7.98     | <.001    |
|                           | ENG1            | 0.592           | 0.1145    | 0.367        | 0.816        | 0.312    | 5.17     | <.001    |
|                           | ENG2            | 1.203           | 0.1121    | 0.983        | 1.423        | 0.701    | 10.73    | <.001    |
|                           | ENG3            | 1.089           | 0.1043    | 0.884        | 1.293        | 0.678    | 10.44    | <.001    |
|                           | ENG4            | 0.332           | 0.0805    | 0.174        | 0.490        | 0.245    | 4.12     | <.001    |
|                           | ENG5            | 0.872           | 0.1067    | 0.663        | 1.081        | 0.503    | 8.18     | <.001    |
|                           | DEV1            | 0.321           | 0.0854    | 0.154        | 0.489        | 0.226    | 3.76     | <.001    |
|                           | DEV2            | 0.367           | 0.1108    | 0.150        | 0.584        | 0.208    | 3.31     | 0.001    |
|                           | DEV3            | 0.378           | 0.0876    | 0.206        | 0.550        | 0.258    | 4.31     | <.001    |
|                           | DEV4            | 0.278           | 0.0823    | 0.116        | 0.439        | 0.204    | 3.38     | 0.001    |
|                           | DEV5            | 0.352           | 0.1109    | 0.135        | 0.570        | 0.199    | 3.17     | 0.002    |
| Workplace Environment     | COL1            | 1.000           | 0.0000    | 1.000        | 1.000        | 0.529    |          |          |
|                           | COL2            | 0.832           | 0.1627    | 0.513        | 1.151        | 0.321    | 5.11     | <.001    |
|                           | COL3            | 1.567           | 0.1723    | 1.229        | 1.905        | 0.701    | 9.09     | <.001    |
|                           | COL4            | 1.409           | 0.1608    | 1.094        | 1.724        | 0.651    | 8.76     | <.001    |
|                           | INN1            | 0.403           | 0.1924    | 0.026        | 0.780        | 0.145    | 2.09     | 0.036    |
|                           | INN2            | 1.507           | 0.1762    | 1.162        | 1.852        | 0.626    | 8.55     | <.001    |
|                           | INN3            | 0.171           | 0.1830    | -0.187       | 0.529        | 0.084    | 0.93     | 0.351    |
|                           | TRU1            | 0.238           | 0.1592    | -0.074       | 0.550        | 0.112    | 1.50     | 0.135    |
|                           | TRU2            | 1.650           | 0.1790    | 1.299        | 2.001        | 0.721    | 9.22     | <.001    |
|                           | TRU3            | 1.350           | 0.1555    | 1.045        | 1.655        | 0.640    | 8.68     | <.001    |
|                           | TRU4            | 1.306           | 0.1476    | 1.017        | 1.595        | 0.659    | 8.85     | <.001    |
| Employee Loyalty          | EMO1            | 1.000           | 0.0000    | 1.000        | 1.000        | 0.652    |          |          |
|                           | EMO2            | 0.859           | 0.0867    | 0.689        | 1.029        | 0.613    | 9.91     | <.001    |
|                           | EMO3            | 1.022           | 0.0978    | 0.830        | 1.213        | 0.659    | 10.45    | <.001    |
|                           | NOR1            | 1.008           | 0.1024    | 0.807        | 1.209        | 0.612    | 9.84     | <.001    |
|                           | NOR2            | 1.023           | 0.0920    | 0.843        | 1.203        | 0.714    | 11.12    | <.001    |
|                           | NOR3            | 0.953           | 0.0936    | 0.769        | 1.136        | 0.636    | 10.18    | <.001    |

This measurement model table presents the factor loadings of observed indicators on three latent constructs—Human Resource Strategies, Workplace Environment, and Employee Loyalty—along with their statistical significance and confidence intervals,

thereby assessing the reliability and validity of the measurement structure. For Human Resource Strategies, all observed indicators (HIR1–HIR5, ENG1–ENG5, and DEV1–DEV5) show positive and statistically significant loadings, with standardized

coefficients ( $\beta$ ) ranging from moderate to strong, indicating that hiring, engagement, and development-related items effectively represent the latent construct; reference indicators (HIR1) are fixed at 1.000 for model identification, while the remaining indicators exhibit high z-values and  $p < .001$ , confirming strong convergent validity. In the case of Workplace Environment, most indicators related to collaboration (COL), innovation (INN), and trust (TRU) load significantly on the latent factor, with particularly strong contributions from COL3, COL4, INN2, and TRU2–TRU4, as reflected by high estimates, standardized loadings, and significant p-values, although a few indicators such as INN3 and TRU1 show weaker and statistically non-significant

loadings, suggesting they may be less effective in capturing this construct. For Employee Loyalty, all emotional (EMO) and normative (NOR) indicators demonstrate strong, positive, and statistically significant loadings, with high standardized coefficients and narrow confidence intervals, indicating that these observed variables reliably measure employee loyalty. Overall, the table demonstrates that the measurement model is largely robust, with strong factor loadings and statistical support for most indicators, thereby providing evidence of good construct validity and reliability, while also highlighting a small number of weaker indicators that may require refinement.

**Table-4: Variances and Covariances**

| Variable 1 | Variable 2 | Estimate | SE     | Lower | Upper | $\beta$ | z     | p     |
|------------|------------|----------|--------|-------|-------|---------|-------|-------|
| HIR1       | HIR1       | 0.772    | 0.0612 | 0.652 | 0.892 | 0.615   | 12.61 | <.001 |
| HIR2       | HIR2       | 0.562    | 0.0493 | 0.465 | 0.658 | 0.493   | 11.40 | <.001 |
| HIR3       | HIR3       | 1.612    | 0.1164 | 1.384 | 1.840 | 0.857   | 13.85 | <.001 |
| HIR4       | HIR4       | 0.747    | 0.0592 | 0.631 | 0.863 | 0.618   | 12.61 | <.001 |
| HIR5       | HIR5       | 0.815    | 0.0601 | 0.697 | 0.933 | 0.761   | 13.56 | <.001 |
| ENG1       | ENG1       | 1.724    | 0.1237 | 1.481 | 1.966 | 0.903   | 13.93 | <.001 |
| ENG2       | ENG2       | 0.705    | 0.0605 | 0.587 | 0.824 | 0.509   | 11.66 | <.001 |
| ENG3       | ENG3       | 0.660    | 0.0551 | 0.552 | 0.768 | 0.540   | 11.98 | <.001 |
| ENG4       | ENG4       | 0.924    | 0.0650 | 0.797 | 1.052 | 0.940   | 14.22 | <.001 |
| ENG5       | ENG5       | 1.131    | 0.0830 | 0.968 | 1.294 | 0.747   | 13.63 | <.001 |
| DEV1       | DEV1       | 1.055    | 0.0745 | 0.909 | 1.201 | 0.949   | 14.16 | <.001 |
| DEV2       | DEV2       | 1.775    | 0.1276 | 1.525 | 2.025 | 0.957   | 13.91 | <.001 |
| DEV3       | DEV3       | 1.083    | 0.0764 | 0.933 | 1.233 | 0.933   | 14.17 | <.001 |
| DEV4       | DEV4       | 0.995    | 0.0701 | 0.857 | 1.132 | 0.958   | 14.19 | <.001 |
| DEV5       | DEV5       | 1.790    | 0.1288 | 1.537 | 2.042 | 0.960   | 13.90 | <.001 |
| COL1       | COL1       | 0.412    | 0.0312 | 0.351 | 0.473 | 0.720   | 13.21 | <.001 |
| COL2       | COL2       | 1.042    | 0.0742 | 0.896 | 1.187 | 0.897   | 14.04 | <.001 |
| COL3       | COL3       | 0.398    | 0.0329 | 0.334 | 0.463 | 0.508   | 12.10 | <.001 |
| COL4       | COL4       | 0.420    | 0.0335 | 0.354 | 0.486 | 0.577   | 12.53 | <.001 |
| INN1       | INN1       | 1.787    | 0.1270 | 1.538 | 2.036 | 0.979   | 14.07 | <.001 |
| INN2       | INN2       | 0.558    | 0.0432 | 0.473 | 0.643 | 0.608   | 12.91 | <.001 |
| INN3       | INN3       | 1.659    | 0.1178 | 1.428 | 1.890 | 0.993   | 14.08 | <.001 |
| TRU1       | TRU1       | 1.264    | 0.0895 | 1.088 | 1.439 | 0.987   | 14.12 | <.001 |
| TRU2       | TRU2       | 0.396    | 0.0331 | 0.331 | 0.461 | 0.481   | 11.96 | <.001 |
| TRU3       | TRU3       | 0.407    | 0.0325 | 0.343 | 0.471 | 0.591   | 12.52 | <.001 |
| TRU4       | TRU4       | 0.339    | 0.0276 | 0.285 | 0.393 | 0.566   | 12.29 | <.001 |
| EMO1       | EMO1       | 0.373    | 0.0304 | 0.313 | 0.432 | 0.573   | 12.26 | <.001 |

|                           |                           |       |        |       |       |       |       |       |
|---------------------------|---------------------------|-------|--------|-------|-------|-------|-------|-------|
| EMO2                      | EMO2                      | 0.315 | 0.0254 | 0.265 | 0.365 | 0.624 | 12.40 | <.001 |
| EMO3                      | EMO3                      | 0.359 | 0.0293 | 0.302 | 0.417 | 0.566 | 12.26 | <.001 |
| NOR1                      | NOR1                      | 0.454 | 0.0359 | 0.384 | 0.525 | 0.625 | 12.65 | <.001 |
| NOR2                      | NOR2                      | 0.260 | 0.0228 | 0.215 | 0.305 | 0.492 | 11.40 | <.001 |
| NOR3                      | NOR3                      | 0.350 | 0.0283 | 0.294 | 0.405 | 0.596 | 12.36 | <.001 |
| Human Resource Strategies | Human Resource Strategies | 0.404 | 0.0682 | 0.270 | 0.537 | 1.000 | 5.92  | <.001 |
| Workplace Environment     | Workplace Environment     | 0.086 | 0.0189 | 0.049 | 0.123 | 0.830 | 4.55  | <.001 |
| Employee Loyalty          | Employee Loyalty          | 0.183 | 0.0305 | 0.123 | 0.243 | 0.865 | 6.00  | <.001 |
| Workplace Environment     | Employee Loyalty          | 0.092 | 0.0148 | 0.063 | 0.121 | 0.745 | 6.22  | <.001 |

This table reports the estimated variances and covariances for all observed indicators and latent constructs in the measurement model, providing insight into the amount of variability within each variable and the strength of association between selected constructs. The diagonal entries for observed indicators (HIR, ENG, DEV, COL, INN, TRU, EMO, and NOR items) represent their variances, all of which are positive, statistically significant ( $p < .001$ ), and accompanied by high z-values, indicating substantial and reliably estimated variability in each item; the standardized variance coefficients ( $\beta$ ) are generally moderate to high, suggesting that these indicators capture meaningful unique variance rather than measurement error alone. Similarly, the latent constructs—Human Resource Strategies, Workplace

Environment, and Employee Loyalty—also show significant variances, confirming that these underlying factors meaningfully differ across observations and are well-defined in the model. Importantly, the covariance between Workplace Environment and Employee Loyalty is positive and statistically significant (Estimate = 0.092,  $\beta = 0.745$ ,  $p < .001$ ), indicating a strong and meaningful relationship whereby improvements in the workplace environment are closely associated with higher levels of employee loyalty. Overall, the consistently significant variances affirm the reliability of both observed and latent variables, while the significant covariance highlights a theoretically coherent and empirically supported linkage between key organizational constructs within the model.

**Table-5: Intercepts**

| Variable | Intercept | SE    | Lower | Upper | z     | p     |
|----------|-----------|-------|-------|-------|-------|-------|
| HIR1     | 2.015     | 0.052 | 1.913 | 2.117 | 38.75 | <.001 |
| HIR2     | 2.330     | 0.049 | 2.234 | 2.426 | 47.55 | <.001 |
| HIR3     | 3.158     | 0.064 | 3.033 | 3.283 | 49.34 | <.001 |
| HIR4     | 2.249     | 0.051 | 2.149 | 2.349 | 44.10 | <.001 |
| HIR5     | 2.288     | 0.048 | 2.194 | 2.382 | 47.67 | <.001 |
| ENG1     | 3.403     | 0.065 | 3.276 | 3.530 | 52.35 | <.001 |
| ENG2     | 2.249     | 0.054 | 2.143 | 2.355 | 41.65 | <.001 |
| ENG3     | 2.056     | 0.051 | 1.956 | 2.156 | 40.31 | <.001 |
| ENG4     | 1.832     | 0.046 | 1.742 | 1.922 | 39.83 | <.001 |
| ENG5     | 2.674     | 0.056 | 2.564 | 2.784 | 47.75 | <.001 |
| DEV1     | 2.346     | 0.049 | 2.250 | 2.442 | 47.88 | <.001 |
| DEV2     | 3.142     | 0.064 | 3.017 | 3.267 | 49.09 | <.001 |
| DEV3     | 2.234     | 0.050 | 2.136 | 2.332 | 44.68 | <.001 |

|                           |       |       |       |       |       |       |
|---------------------------|-------|-------|-------|-------|-------|-------|
| DEV4                      | 2.280 | 0.047 | 2.188 | 2.372 | 48.51 | <.001 |
| DEV5                      | 3.403 | 0.065 | 3.276 | 3.530 | 52.35 | <.001 |
| COL1                      | 1.749 | 0.035 | 1.680 | 1.818 | 50.00 | <.001 |
| COL2                      | 2.697 | 0.050 | 2.599 | 2.795 | 53.94 | <.001 |
| COL3                      | 1.934 | 0.040 | 1.856 | 2.012 | 48.35 | <.001 |
| COL4                      | 1.864 | 0.039 | 1.788 | 1.940 | 47.79 | <.001 |
| INN1                      | 3.512 | 0.064 | 3.387 | 3.637 | 54.88 | <.001 |
| INN2                      | 2.202 | 0.043 | 2.118 | 2.286 | 51.21 | <.001 |
| INN3                      | 3.465 | 0.062 | 3.344 | 3.586 | 55.89 | <.001 |
| TRU1                      | 2.707 | 0.053 | 2.603 | 2.811 | 51.08 | <.001 |
| TRU2                      | 2.002 | 0.041 | 1.922 | 2.082 | 48.83 | <.001 |
| TRU3                      | 1.905 | 0.038 | 1.831 | 1.979 | 50.13 | <.001 |
| TRU4                      | 1.971 | 0.036 | 1.900 | 2.042 | 54.75 | <.001 |
| EMO1                      | 1.819 | 0.037 | 1.747 | 1.891 | 49.16 | <.001 |
| EMO2                      | 1.689 | 0.033 | 1.624 | 1.754 | 51.18 | <.001 |
| EMO3                      | 1.944 | 0.037 | 1.872 | 2.016 | 52.54 | <.001 |
| NOR1                      | 2.020 | 0.039 | 1.944 | 2.096 | 51.79 | <.001 |
| NOR2                      | 1.898 | 0.034 | 1.832 | 1.964 | 55.82 | <.001 |
| NOR3                      | 1.890 | 0.035 | 1.821 | 1.959 | 54.00 | <.001 |
| Human Resource Strategies | 0.000 | 0.000 | 0.000 | 0.000 |       |       |
| Workplace Environment     | 0.000 | 0.000 | 0.000 | 0.000 |       |       |
| Employee Loyalty          | 0.000 | 0.000 | 0.000 | 0.000 |       |       |

This table presents the intercept estimates for all observed indicators and latent constructs in the model, where the intercept represents the expected mean value of each variable when the latent factors are set to zero, thereby reflecting the baseline or average response level of each item. All observed indicators related to Human Resource Strategies (HIR1–HIR5), Employee Engagement (ENG1–ENG5), Employee Development (DEV1–DEV5), Collaboration (COL1–COL4), Innovation (INN1–INN3), Trust (TRU1–TRU4), Emotional loyalty (EMO1–EMO3), and Normative loyalty (NOR1–NOR3) show positive intercepts with relatively small standard errors, very high z-values, and statistically significant p-values ( $p < .001$ ), indicating that respondents, on average, reported levels significantly above zero on all these measured items and that these mean estimates are highly precise. The 95% confidence intervals for each item are narrow and do not include zero, further confirming the stability and reliability of the estimated means across the sample. In contrast, the intercepts for the latent variables—Human Resource Strategies, Workplace

Environment, and Employee Loyalty—are fixed at zero with zero standard error, which is a standard identification constraint in structural equation modeling to define the scale of latent constructs rather than an empirical finding. Overall, the results indicate consistently positive and significant baseline perceptions across all observed dimensions, supporting the adequacy of the measurement model and suggesting generally favorable respondent evaluations of HR practices, workplace conditions, and loyalty-related attributes.

## 5 DISCUSSION AND CONCLUSION

The current investigation aimed to assess if human resource strategies (HRS) influenced two principal entity results: workplace environment and employee loyalty. The core purpose was to ascertain if more organized and progressive HRS correlated with a more assistive workplace environment and elevated loyalty among staff in studied entities. By addressing atmospheric and motivational results together, the investigation positioned HRS beyond operational but

as an integrated tool for constructing internal settings sustaining prolonged output.

Outcomes showed HRS favorably tied to workplace environment. Entities investing in orderly hiring and choice, significant skill growth, equitable and progressive output review, and clear info flow often reported more positive, cooperative, and creativity-assistive environments. This trend implied HRS did not function alone; instead, they seemed to affect shared principles, standards, and routine interactions, thereby defining staff entity experiences. Practically, results suggested that when leadership crafted HR frameworks around progression, engagement, and reliability, the entity's atmospheric fabric shifted from directive routines to more transparent and team-oriented operations.

The investigation also indicated HRS linked positively with employee loyalty. Staff in entities stressing equitable handling, progression chances, and expectation clarity often reported stronger mental affiliation to their entity. HR frameworks communicating sustained staff investment—via skill building, career advancement, and assistive feedback—seemed to cultivate obligation and goal alignment. Thus, HRS appeared as vital tools through which entities nurtured fidelity, lowered disengagement risks, and fostered settings for contributions exceeding basic duties.

Placing these outcomes in prior scholarship, they paralleled earlier observational and theoretical efforts. The favorable HRS–loyalty tie mirrored discoveries that creative or high-engagement HRS were top loyalty forecasters (Agarwala, 2003; Paul & Anantharaman, 2004). Previous efforts showed approaches like progression-centric reviews, thorough skill building, and assistive settings fostered stronger emotional and ethical loyalty, often via entity backing and equity perceptions (Meyer & Smith, 2000; Giauque et al., 2010). This investigation's outcomes aligned with this exchange rationale: staff seemed to return to entity growth investment and fair handling with higher loyalty.

The discovery that HRS tied to workplace environment also matched studies connecting HR frameworks, environment, and creativity-assistive atmospheres. Scholarship on HR frameworks and offering creativity implied HRS molded not just output but cultural requisites for ingenuity and shift (Lau & Ngo, 2004; Valle & Jiménez, 2005). Analyses on creativity-stimulating environments similarly stressed hiring, progression, and engagement approaches aided building environments encouraging concept exchange and trials (Martins & Terblanche, 2003; Shipton et al., 2005). Efforts on visionary leadership and environment further noted leadership conducts and HR frameworks jointly molded creativity and shift atmospheres (Sorros et al., 2008). This investigation bolstered this proof by showing HRS intertwined with atmospheric traits, beyond mere technical processes.

Furthermore, the twin emphasis on environment and loyalty echoed research centering HRS in unified models tying personnel oversight, atmosphere, and output. Studies in assistance and financial contexts showed HRS affected staff atmosphere perceptions, relating to output metrics (Gelade & Ivery, 2003; Cho et al., 2006). Efforts on info exchange and creativity similarly contended HRS fostered loyalty and info sharing, jointly advancing creativity (Ordaz et al., 2011; Özbağ et al., 2013). By showing HRS tied to both atmospheric setting and staff entity attachment, this investigation provided added observational backing to HRS as core unifying tool in entity internal structure.

Simultaneously, outcomes prompted critical thought on these ties' limits. While patterns were evident and steady, they stemmed from particular settings, with association strength likely reliant on wider entity and regulatory contexts, leadership views, and staff hopes. Prior analyses already noted HR frameworks varied by industry, region, and field, with not all approaches equally relevant across (Jayaram et al., 1999; Beugelsdijk, 2009). Thus, this investigation's outcomes reinforced the notion that HRS–result ties were context-shaped, with environment and loyalty emerging from formal HR guidelines plus informal approaches, leadership modes, and entity legacies.

Regarding the specific claim that human resource strategies affect workplace environment and employee loyalty, the investigation concluded that HRS indeed served as key bases for both. Entities applying more aligned, progressive, and cooperative HR frameworks often showed environments more assistive, team-oriented, and learning-open, while staff reported stronger employer attachment. Proof implied HRS were not impartial backdrop processes; instead, they actively aided shared principles/norms construction and molded staff belonging senses.

## 6 STUDY IMPLICATIONS

This investigation's ramifications are practical and scholarly, emphasizing human resource strategies (HRS) centrality in molding entity internal dynamics, as favorable HRS, workplace environment, and employee loyalty ties imply HR exceeds administrative to integrated tools for settings where staff excel (Agarwala, 2003; Paul & Anantharaman, 2004). Choices on hiring, skill building, review, benefits, and info thus require long-term atmospheric fabric and staff-entity relation investments. Practically, entities pursuing positive, team-oriented, creativity-assistive environments should embrace aligned HR approach clusters focused on principle-aligned choice, ongoing education, and progressive input (Martins & Terblanche, 2003; Shipton et al., 2005). When staff see HRS as equitable, clear, and truly progressive, they display stronger loyalty, stressing backing and equity importance (Meyer & Smith, 2000; Giauque et al., 2010). Discoveries also imply for leadership and shift, as leaders must match HR guidelines to desired atmospheric principles and employ review, benefit, and progression systems to indicate team, info exchange, and creativity valuation (Lau & Ngo, 2004; Valle & Jiménez, 2005). Thus, HR frameworks serve as tangible tools converting leadership aims to daily encounters, backing views that environment, atmosphere, and HRS form unified behavior/output systems (Gelade & Ivery, 2003; Ordaz et al., 2011). At strategy and oversight levels, the investigation suggests entities targeting lasting rivalry edge view HRS as strategic personnel/social asset builders (Bontis, 2001; Birasnav & Rangnekar, 2009). Robust, progressive, cooperative HR

framework investments likely produce resilient environments and devoted workforces, creativity/output prerequisites in shifting settings (Tan & Nasurdin, 2011; Özbağ et al., 2013). Lastly, the investigation urges future probes on how/when HRS convert to stronger environments/higher loyalty, and how these affect creativity/entity success across varied settings (Preacher et al., 2007; Sarstedt et al., 2011).

## 7 FUTURE SCOPE OF THE STUDY

The investigation's outcomes unlock multiple paths for upcoming scholarship on human resource strategies' integrated role in environment and loyalty molding. Extending current proof, future efforts could use time-series designs to better grasp HRS, environment, and loyalty shifts over periods and clarify cause routes over inferences. Additional efforts might include extra intermediary/adjusting factors—like leadership mode, info oversight processes, work atmosphere, and sensed entity backing—for fuller models of HR framework translations to atmospheric/motivational results across entity settings (Gelade & Ivery, 2003; Ordaz et al., 2011). Contrastive scholarship across industries, ownership forms, and regions would aid testing pattern holds in state entities, medium firms, and diverse cultural settings, given prior proof of notable HRS variances by field/region (Jayaram et al., 1999; Beugelsdijk, 2009). Future efforts could employ multi-tier methods linking entity-level HRS to group atmosphere and personal views, capturing tier-cross influences precisely, and blend numerical approaches like path modeling with qualitative to probe staff HRS interpretations/daily experiences. Lastly, scope exists to tie environment/loyalty more directly to creativity/output results, allowing future scholarship to follow full sequences from HRS via atmospheric/mental tools to tangible entity success metrics in rivalrous/shifting settings (Tan & Nasurdin, 2011; Özbağ et al., 2013).

## References

- Agarwala, T. (2003). Innovative human resource practices and organizational commitment: An

- empirical investigation. *The International Journal of Human Resource Management*, 14(2), 175–197. Routledge.
- Ahmad, S., & Schroeder, R. G. (2003). The impact of human resource management practices on operational performance: Recognizing country and industry differences. *Journal of Operations Management*, 21, 19–43.
  - Alvaro, L. (2009). Knowledge as a mediator between HRM practices and innovative activity. *Human Resource Management*, 485–503.
  - Amo, B. W., & Kolvereid, L. (2005). Organizational strategy, individual personality and innovation behavior. *Journal of Enterprising Culture*, 13(1), 7–19.
  - Bauernschuster, S., Falck, O., & Heblich, S. (2009). Training and innovation. *Journal of Human Capital*, 323–353.
  - Beugelsdik, S. (2009). Strategic human resource practices and product innovation. *Organization Studies*, 822–847.
  - Birasnav, & Rangnekar. (2009). Structure of human capital enhancing human resource practices in India. *International Journal of Business and Management*, 4(5), 226–238.
  - Boer, H., & During, W. (2001). Innovation, what innovation? A comparison between product, process and organizational innovation. *International Journal of Technology Management*, 22(1–3), 83–107.
  - Bontis, N. (2001). Assessing knowledge assets: A review of the models used to measure intellectual capital. *International Journal of Management Reviews*, 3(1), 41–60.
  - Cho, S., Woods, R. H., Jang, S., Cheong, S., & Erdem, M. (2006). Measuring the impact of human resource management practices on hospitality firms' performances. *International Journal of Hospitality Management*, 25(2), 262–277.
  - Conway, E. (2003). Relating career stage to attitudes towards HR practices and commitment: Evidence of interaction effects? *The Learning, Innovation and Knowledge (LINK) Research Centre Working Paper Series (WP 01–03)*. Retrieved from <http://www.link.dcu.ie/publications/workingpaperseries/> (Accessed: December 20, 2012)
  - Delaney, J. T., & Huselid, M. A. (1996). The impact of human resource management practices on perceptions of organizational performance. *Academy of Management Journal*, 39(4), 949–969. JSTOR.
  - Dhar, R. L. (2015). The effects of high performance human resource practices on service innovative behaviours. *International Journal of Hospitality Management*, 51, 67–75.
  - Fiorito, J., Bozeman, D. P., Young, A., & Meurs, J. A. (2007). Organizational commitment, human resource practices, and organizational characteristics. *Journal of Managerial Issues*, 19(2), 186–207.
  - Gelade, G. A., & Ivery, M. (2003). The impact of human resource management and work climate on organizational performance. *Personnel Psychology*, 56(2), 383–404. *Personnel Psychology, Inc.*
  - Gellatly, I. R., Hunter, K. H., Currie, L. G., & Irving, P. G. (2009). HRM practices and organizational commitment. *The International Journal of Human Resource Management*, 20(4), 869–884. Routledge.
  - Giauque, D., Resentera, F., & Siggen, M. (2010). The relationship between HRM practices and organizational commitment of knowledge workers: Facts obtained from Swiss SMEs. *Human Resource Development International*, 13(2), 185–205. Routledge.
  - Gumusluog, L., & Ilsev, A. (2009). Transformational leadership and organizational innovation: The role of external and internal support for innovation. *Product Innovation Management*, 26(3), 264–277.
  - Hashim, J. (2010). Human resource management practices on organizational commitment: The Islamic perspective. *Personnel Review*, 39(6), 785–799.
  - Hon, Y. A., & Lu, H. (2014). Are we paid to be creative? The effects of compensation gap on creativity in an expatriate context. *Journal of World Business*, 50(1), 159–167.
  - Jayaram, J., Droge, C., & Vickery, S. K. (1999). The impact of human resource management

- practices on manufacturing performance. *Journal of Operations Management*, 18(1), 1–20.
- Kachelmeier, S. J., & Williamson, M. G. (2010). Attracting creativity: The initial and aggregate effects of contract selection on creativity-weighted productivity. *The Accounting Review*, 85(5), 1669–1691.
  - Kun, Q., Xiaolin, L., & Xiaoyun, W. (2008). HRM practices and organizational commitment: A study about IT employees from Chinese private-owned enterprises. In *Proceedings of the 4th International Conference on Wireless Communications, Networking and Mobile Computing* (pp. 1–6).
  - Lau, C. M., & Ngo, H. Y. (2004). The HR system, organizational culture and product innovation. *International Business Review*, 13(6), 685–703.
  - Leede, J. K., & Loose, J. K. (2005). Innovation and HRM: Towards an integrated framework. *Creativity and Innovation Management*, 14(2), 108–117.
  - Liao, J., Kickul, J. R., & Ma, H. (2009). Organizational dynamic capability and innovation: An empirical examination of internet firms. *Journal of Small Business Management*, 47(3), 63–86.
  - Ling, T. C., & Nasirudin, M. A. (2010). HRM practices and organizational innovation: An empirical study in Malaysia. *The Journal of Applied Business Research*, 105–116.
  - Mario, J., & Donate, J. D. (2014). The role of knowledge-oriented leadership in knowledge management practices and innovation. *Journal of Business Research*, 68(2), 360–370.
  - Martins, E. C., & Terblanche, F. (2003). Building organizational culture that stimulates creativity and innovation. *European Journal of Innovation Management*, 6(1), 64–74.
  - Meyer, J. P., & Smith, C. A. (2000). HRM practices and organizational commitment: Test of a mediation model. *Canadian Journal of Administrative Sciences*, 17(4), 319–331.
  - Meyer, J., & Smith, C. A. (2000). HRM practices and organizational commitment. *Canadian Journal of Administrative Sciences*, 17(4), 319–331.
  - Obgonna, & Harris. (2000). Leadership style, organization culture and performance: Empirical evidence from UK companies. *International Journal of Human Resource Management*, 11(4), 766–788.
  - Ordaz, C. C., Cruz, J. G., Ginal, S. E., & Cabrera, R. (2011). The influence of human resource management on knowledge sharing and innovation in Spain: The mediating role of affective commitment. *The International Journal of Human Resource Management*, 22(7), 1442–1463.
  - Özbağ, G. K., Esen, M., & Esen, D. (2013). The impact of HRM capabilities on innovation mediated by knowledge management capability. *Procedia – Social and Behavioral Sciences*, 99, 784–793.
  - Paul, A. K., & Anantharaman, R. N. (2004). Influence of HRM practices on organizational commitment: A study among software professionals in India. *Human Resource Development Quarterly*, 15(1), 77–88.
  - Pfeffer, J. (1998). Seven practices of successful organizations. *California Management Review*, 40(2), 96–124.
  - Preacher, K. J., Rucker, D. D., & Hayes, A. F. (2007). Addressing moderated mediation hypotheses: Theory, methods, and prescriptions. *Multivariate Behavioral Research*, 42(1), 185–227.
  - Prieto Pastor, I. M., Perez Santana, M. P., & Martín Sierra, C. (2010). Managing knowledge through human resource practices: Empirical examination on the Spanish automotive industry. *The International Journal of Human Resource Management*, 21(13), 2452–2467.
  - Sarstedt, M., Henseler, J., & Ringle, C. M. (2011). Multi-group analysis in partial least squares (PLS) path modeling: Alternative methods and empirical results. *Measurement and Research Methods in International Marketing*, 22, 195–218.
  - Schneider, A., Hommel, G., & Blettner, M. (2010). Linear regression analysis. *Deutsches Ärzteblatt International*, 107(44), 776–782.
  - Şendoğdu, A. A., Kocabacak, A., & Güven, Ş. (2013). The relationship between human resource management practices and organizational commitment: A field study. *Procedia - Social and Behavioral Sciences*, 99, 818–827.
  - Shahnawaz, M. G., & Juyal, R. C. (2006). Human resource management practices and organizational

- commitment in different organizations. *Journal of the Indian Academy of Applied Psychology*, 32(3), 267–274.
- Sharma, S. C., & Gupta, R. (2020). A study on the effects of new age technology tools on work life balance of female employees in education industry of India. *Life*, 29(6), 5147–5158.
  - Sharma, S. C., & Gupta, R. (2020). A Study on the Effects of New Age Technology Tools on Work Life Balance of Female Employees in Education Industry of India. *life*, 29(6), 5147–5158.
  - Sharma, S. C., & Gupta, R. (2020). Job satisfaction: difference in levels among selected industries. *Int J Rec Technol Eng (IJRTE)*, 8(6).
  - Sharma, S. C., & Gupta, R. (2024). Assessing the relationship between work-life balance, job satisfaction, and employee engagement in academia. *International Journal of Research and Technology*, 12(3).
  - Sharma, S. C., & Gupta, R. (2024). Assessing the relationship between work-life balance, job satisfaction, and employee engagement in academia. *International Journal of Research and Technology*, 12(3).
  - Shipton, H., Fay, D., West, M., Patterson, M., & Birdi, K. (2005). Managing people to promote innovation. *Creativity and Innovation Management*, 14(2), 118–128.
  - Sorros, J. C., Cooper, B. K., & Santora, J. C. (2008). Building a climate for innovation through transformational leadership and organizational culture. *Journal of Leadership and Organizational Studies*, 15(2), 145–158.
  - Tan, C. L., & Nasurdin, A. M. (2011). Human resource management practices and organizational innovation: Assessing the mediating role of knowledge management effectiveness. *Electronic Journal of Knowledge Management*, 9(2), 155–167.
  - Thompson, V. A. (1965). Bureaucracy and innovation. *Administrative Science Quarterly*, 10, 1–20.
  - Valle, S., & Jiménez, J. (2005). Innovation and human resource management. *International Journal of Manpower*, 26(4), 364–381.
  - Wan, D., Ong, C. H., & Lee, F. (2005). Determinants of innovation. *Technovation*, 25(3), 261–268.
  - Wei, L. Q., Liv, J., & Herndon, N. (2011). SHRM and product innovation: The moderating effects of organization and structure in Chinese firms. *The International Journal of Human Resource Management*, 22(1), 19–33.